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"Library Research for Librarians" was the title of a conference held at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in March 1979. Sponsored by the Librarians Association of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, this conference attracted 110 librarians from throughout the southeastern United States.

The purpose of the conference was to stimulate practicing librarians to undertake research by helping them identify research topics, devise workable methodologies, recognize the standards by which research is judged, and understand the requirements for preparation of manuscripts for publication.

The program committee for the conference recognized the importance of research for libraries and for librarians. For the development of libraries as well as for their more effective and efficient management, many questions need to be answered and problems solved. Not only must we have more and better trained librarians with advanced degrees who can undertake sophisticated research, but the profession also needs the participation of many other interested researchers who can contribute sound, honest, clearly written studies.

Librarians have the raw material for research at hand: reports, statistics, library collections, archives, and experience.

They have the need to know, because most of the research to be done has quite practical application to librarians' daily activities. Academic librarians also have additional incentives in many libraries, with recognition and promotion as rewards for successful researchers. But few librarians have had training in research. Many are interested in research but need some help. This is the conference designed to give.

In his concluding remarks at the conference, Paul S. Koda of the university library called attention to the happy work situation for librarians:

"We have been called a "practitioner" discipline because our work and our thinking about our work constitute a reciprocal give and take of idea and doing. This organic, ever-evolving view of "our" profession was described years ago by the famous theologian and scholar Theodor Mommsen. He summed up the work of many professions as the best of two worlds. The "pragmatic historian" he described is today's "pragmatic scholar-librarian."

Do we not share the best of these two worlds? As pragmatic scholar-librarians let us begin and let us continue those habits of mind and application which hone our skills and refine our research. Let us become capable to the point where we not only carry on the day-to-day business of our libraries, but also provide the intellectual means to improve our libraries for the future.

Those attending the conference were very positive in their evaluations and praised the speakers highly. The following three articles are based on addresses given at the conference, and we are pleased that they are now available to a wider audience through their publication in College & Research Libraries.
ANYONE WHO IS ABOUT TO undertake a research study makes some assumptions—the fewer assumptions, the better; but it is impossible to begin any project without making at least one assumption. The following comments about conducting library research are based on the assumption that there is some sort of underlying order in the way libraries operate, that there are some phenomena that cause or result from other phenomena and that, if we look carefully enough, we can detect that order and those relationships.

In the words of one of the standard texts on scientific investigation: “The function of a science . . . is to establish general laws covering the behavior of the empirical events or objects with which the science in question is concerned.” This is a short and simple statement, but one that has many implications if we try to apply it to libraries.

One of the implications of viewing librarianship as a field susceptible to scientific research is that we accept the possibility of eventually tying together the findings of all research into a broad explanation of the field.

As a result, we expect that all who report research will recognize and note the limits of their own studies, explain in detail how they went about collecting and analyzing data, and give us the information we need to repeat their studies in other settings or to build on their studies by attacking the questions they raised and were not able to answer.

This view—that library science is a field where studies should have some relationship to each other (with the object of eventually establishing general laws for the field)—means that one of the best places to find an idea for research is in studies that have already been completed.

Any comments about possible research topics in librarianship can only touch the surface of a few of the areas which wait to be explored. However, one must begin somewhere, and I propose to begin by noting some of the recent studies that have received wide attention or that seem to me to be interesting because of the research questions they raise.

I have arbitrarily divided the studies into four groups, which I am calling (1) the structure of information—that is, studies about the ownership of information, the characteristics of various physical formats in which information is recorded, and the characteristics of producers of information; (2) user behavior—including studies about the people for whom we collect and process information; (3) policy decisions—studies about the organizations, policies, and proce-
dures we set up to gather the information and serve the people; and (4) performance measures—studies on standards and measurements by which we judge our success.

THE STRUCTURE OF INFORMATION

It seems logical to start this discussion with a consideration of the raw materials from which libraries or information centers are built. There are many unanswered questions about the structure of information. Who actually owns information? Who should pay when information is transferred? To whom should the payment be made?

The report on library photocopying prepared by King Research for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is an example of a study that arose out of the need for more information on the possible effects of the new copyright law. In 1976 NCLIS awarded a contract to King Research "to provide estimates of the extent of photocopying and to study alternative royalty payment mechanisms." The National Science Foundation and the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works (CONTU) also contributed to the funding. The study was based on data about photocopying activities collected from a national sample of about 300 libraries. These data were gathered in order to estimate the total volume of photocopying going on in libraries and also to estimate the amount of photocopied material that was actually under copyright protection.

Data for this study were collected during the year before the new copyright law went into effect. As the report itself warns, the behavior of everyone concerned may have changed after the copyright law went into effect in 1978. Do you know how (if at all) the photocopying practices in your own library changed after January 1, 1978? If there were changes, what effect did these have on the library's users? Do the changes appear to hinder any group's access to information? In academic institutions, what effect did the changes have on how instruction is carried on? On research?

With the five-year review of the copyright law scheduled for the early 1980s, the need to evaluate in an objective manner the various guidelines and interpretations which accompanied the law should be obvious to us all. You do not have to do a major, funded study to make a contribution here. Careful, systematic, objective collection of data in your library, documenting what happens to the way people request and use various kinds of information, can help.

There is also much that we do not know about the various physical formats in which information is recorded. We could use more studies about the characteristics of various formats—which ones are most suitable for which types of information and which are best or preferred by which types of users.

For some types of materials (for example, periodicals), we have had a choice of physical formats for some time (microfilm, microfiche, or hard copy), and a fair amount of research has been done on whether hard copy is better or worse for various purposes than is a microform.

In comparison, we know relatively little about periodical indexes available in machine-readable form. For what purposes would our users prefer the machine-readable version to the hard-copy version? Under what circumstances can we afford to supply the preferred version? A number of studies have been reported on how specialists (particularly in science and technology) react to indexes in machine-readable form, but there is still much we do not know about how nonspecialists or the specialists in other fields might use them.

Let us move to another aspect of the structure of information. Much emotional debate has been provoked by the question of who pays the costs of information transfer. Public librarians, as well as academic librarians, have been active in this debate.

In 1978, the Public Library Association (PLA) published the results of a questionnaire survey of 930 public libraries, undertaken to gather some information on the state of fee charging in public libraries. The findings of this survey give some general indication of how widespread the practice of fee charging is, but the study raises more questions than it answers, partly because of definitional problems.

In this case, as the PLA report points out, the problems relating to definitions are hard to solve but must be attacked before much progress can be made in this area.
What kind of payment is a fee, as opposed to a fine or a deposit or simply a payment for goods received? Should postal charges be considered fees? In this area, as in many others, we will not get very far in our attempts to study the problem until we decide exactly what we are looking for.

One major research study of 1976, by Bernard M. Fry and Herbert S. White, looked at the producers of a major library resource—scholarly journals—as well as at the relationship between the publishers and libraries. Fry and White concluded that the economic problems caused for libraries by scholarly journals are not due to "wild and uncontrolled increases in the publication of such journals" nor to excessive profits on the part of the publisher.4

In addition, they found some indications that libraries were guided more by perceived value of a journal than by price when making a cancellation decision. However, the question of how librarians make decisions about starting or cancelling subscriptions was one that they identified for further research. We have had some reports on how individual libraries went about making decisions, but we need more systematic and controlled observation of this.

Even though Fry and White suspected that quality influences librarians' decisions about journal subscriptions, they concluded that, if a laissez-faire system is applied to journal publication, the results will not be what some librarians expect. They argued that university presses and other nonprofit publishers will be damaged the most and even predicted that "entire subject disciplines, such as the humanities, would not retain their viability in such a laissez-faire environment."5

Some libraries have made major budget shifts, reallocating funds from book purchases to journals in order to meet rising journal prices. We need to know more about the effects of these shifts, particularly on journals in the humanities. And, of course, we need to look at our relationships with producers of materials other than journals.

USER BEHAVIOR

The second group of research topics deals with the behavior of users. For all those interested in use of the library by nonspecialists, a good place to find out what we know (and also what we need to know) is in an article by Douglas Zweizig and Brenda Dervin, published in 1977 in Advances in Librarianship.6 The article, based on a USOE-funded study, "Strategies for Dealing with the Information Needs of Urban Residents," was intended as a critical review of the available literature on public library users. The authors identified and discussed sixteen studies published between 1949 and 1975 that attempted to measure characteristics of library users or nonusers and to give a picture of the "average user."

After reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of previous research, Zweizig and Dervin concluded that "the old model of user studies—the identification of who uses the library and how much—has been pushed as far as is helpful." They suggest moving on to the questions of why people use libraries and what do people find useful that libraries might be able to provide. "The important question then [for them] is not library use, not library users, but library uses. It is these 'uses,' these 'utilities' around which libraries can plan programs and can measure effectiveness."7

In another discussion of the research needed in public libraries, Zweizig pointed out that public librarians still do not have the information they need on certain important questions: "Where does the greatest proportion of our population get the information it needs to function? What could the library do to benefit a larger proportion of the population? If the library instituted a new service, would it be accepted? Why does such a large proportion of the population not use the public library?"8 Those questions, of course, are basic enough to keep public library researchers busy for some time, but they are also provocative when translated into academic settings.

Academic librarians have also been looking at how their libraries are being used. A recent major research effort on this subject is the NSF-funded study that was started at the University of Pittsburgh in 1975 and completed in 1978—a study that had as its overall objective "to develop measures for determining the extent to which library materials are used, and the full cost of such use."9
There was a short summary of this study in the November 15, 1977, issue of *Library Journal*; but if you have read only that version, you have missed a great deal. The final report (272 pages) is a detailed discussion of methodology and findings of a study that analyzed more than 90 percent of all the external borrowing done at the Hillman Library (the central research library emphasizing the humanities and social sciences) of the University of Pittsburgh from late 1968 through the end of 1975. In addition, sample studies were made of in-library use of monographs and of journals in six of the science/technology departmental libraries.

Perhaps the finding that created the most interest among other university librarians was the fact that 40 percent of the monographs acquired by the Hillman Library in 1969 had not circulated at all by 1975. Of the 22,000-plus items that did circulate, slightly over 16,000 were borrowed during the year of initial acquisition or the year following. Data collected in this study tended to show that the chance of a book being circulated decreases rather rapidly as time passes after acquisition.

I have heard more than one librarian say that the rate of use of new materials in their libraries is higher than the Pittsburgh figure, and there have been critical comments published on the methodology, findings, and interpretations proposed by the Pitt study.10

This is certainly a place where more research could be done. The methodology used in the Pittsburgh study is described in the final report, and anyone ought to be able to replicate part of this study, at least on a small scale. In fact, one of the points tested in the Pitt study was how small a sample could be and still give reliable results in a library use study of this type. The Pittsburgh researchers concluded that random samples of loan records representing as little as three days' circulation produced correlations as high as .95 with the total population, when proportion of circulation by LC class was being studied.

What this means is that librarians who do not have complete retrospective circulation data available in machine-readable form, or who do not have the time or money to undertake a large study, can use much smaller samples to identify broad usage patterns within LC classes.

The Pittsburgh study presents a massive amount of data collection and analysis. The report is generally clear and easy to read for a research study of this type and offers a number of hints about how books and journals circulate in one large research library. I doubt, however, if anyone could read that study without coming up with a new research question every few pages. One study cannot answer all parts of any library problem, but a clearly reported piece of research can offer all sorts of leads to other research topics.

### POLICY DECISIONS

The third area of research outlined earlier—the area referred to as policy decisions—can include any research that looks at the way we set up and operate libraries. Here I choose to overlook many important areas of library operation and mention three that particularly interest me—availability rates, resource sharing, and forms of library catalogs.

For a long period of time we concentrated on building bigger and better collections and bigger and better catalogs to enable people to find what was in those collections, while establishing circulation policies that had little relationship to anything except our own record-keeping convenience. We reached the point when some people pointed out that the best way to judge the effectiveness of decisions about acquisition, cataloging, circulation, and also binding and weeding is to look at how satisfied or frustrated users are when they come to the library looking for specific materials. Buckland’s 1974 publication, *Book Availability and the Library User*, drew together many of the threads of this area of research.11

Other examples of user satisfaction studies (or user frustration studies, depending on your point of view) are the studies done at Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) and reported by Saracevic and others in *College & Research Libraries* and by Kantor in the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*.12

The CWRU researchers looked at why specific author/title searches were not successful. They used a branching technique to
try to determine the overall effect on availability of such factors as number of items that could not be found on the shelves because they were in circulation; number that could not be found because they were missing, misshelved, not yet reshelved, repaired, etc. (referred to as “library malfunctions”); and the number that could not be found because of user error, such as missing the item in the catalog, copying the wrong call number, looking in the wrong collection, etc.

The techniques used in the CWRU research could certainly be applied to other libraries and might tell you a great deal about how well your library is satisfying some users (that is, those with specific requests) and what you ought to do about it. If user error is accounting for a lowered availability rate, then some sort of user education may be in order. If “library malfunctions” are causing frustration, then maybe you need more shelvers, better shelvers, or something else. All of these points are worth investigating.

Discussion of resource sharing pervades librarianship today. Everyone agrees that decisions about resource sharing can potentially influence all aspects of library operation, but few people would presume to explain how all of this will happen. Two of the studies mentioned earlier address resource sharing.

The Fry and White study on the publishing of scholarly journals concluded that interlibrary cooperation in acquisition, lending, and copying journals would affect specific publishers but that more data would be needed to determine whether scholarly journal publishers as a whole would be hurt. They also urged investigation of the motives of librarians in joining consortia and networks.

The Pittsburgh study gave much attention to the possible implications of resource sharing, but still concluded with a list of twelve unanswered questions—any one of which could stimulate numerous studies.

“Closing the catalog” seems to be the watchword for many librarians right now. There has been so much discussion on the topic of closing, freezing, or in some way altering the physical forms of catalogs in the last few years that I hesitate to cite any particular study which might stimulate your thinking or which would summarize for you what we already know.

Individual libraries that have made significant changes in their catalogs (University of Toronto, Ohio State University, New York Public Library, New York State Library, National Library of Medicine, etc.) have been described both formally and informally. Many libraries have prepared position papers on what their own options for their local catalogs will be when the Library of Congress makes it changes to adopt AACR 2.

There are all kinds of possible research questions being tossed around—questions about conversion costs, maintenance costs, costs that would occur if the catalog is not closed, costs that would occur if it is closed.13 There are also questions about the purposes now served by a library catalog and what library staff and library users really need in the way of a catalog.

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The last area of research is the one tentatively called “performance measures.” What is referred to, though, is not only research concerned with identifying the statistics that give the most information about how a library is performing, but also research that attempts to standardize definitions and measurement techniques so that the results of one study can actually be compared with the results of another.

In an interview reported in the December 1978 issue of the ASIS Bulletin, Howard Resnikoff, the new director of the Division of Information Science and Technology at the National Science Foundation, was quoted as saying on this subject: “... standards make possible uniform comparison of the results of different experiences. Standard data bases would make it possible for people to conduct experiments on a common data base that everyone agrees has certain properties so that results can be measured and compared. No field is a science until it has standards and measures.”14

Public librarians have been particularly active in looking for standard definitions and measures. Early in this decade, the PLA
sponsored a study on the measurement of effectiveness in public libraries—a study that resulted in such publications as the one by DeProspo and others called *Performance Measures for Public Libraries* and the data-gathering manual by Altman and others. Although the PLA measurement project was never completed, it has received a great deal of attention. The approach and methodology developed by DeProspo and Altman have been used in a number of subsequent studies in several types of libraries.

A more recent effort by LAMA's Committee on Statistics for Public Libraries, titled *The Collection and Use of Public Library Statistics by State Library Agencies: A Compilation of Forms* and edited by Kenneth Shearer, attempts to determine what statistics the various states require of their public libraries (and also why they are required—legislative mandate, etc.) and makes some suggestions on how state collection of statistics could be improved.

Academic librarians have been goaded into looking more closely at the meaning and usefulness of their own statistics by several outside forces—state legislators, university administrators, members of university program evaluation committees, and specialists in other fields such as Fritz Machlup, who said, in effect, that university librarians were not collecting enough statistics or the right kind of statistics to be able to show what they were doing.

Some of the studies I mentioned earlier—Lynch's report on public library fees and Fry and White's study of journal publishing—complained about the difficulty of doing survey research when there are no commonly accepted definitions of terms or when statistics are not kept and reported in a uniform way. If you are interested in delving into past research on measurement, look at Lancaster's 1977 publication on measurement and evaluation. It brings together studies from all areas of library service and ought to stimulate your thinking along these lines.

The point made at the beginning of this paper—that scientific research builds on itself until a clear pattern emerges of the important relationships in a field—should be reemphasized here. Without measures that have a consistent meaning from one study to another, we cannot hope to have coordinated and useful research in librarianship.

**CONCLUSIONS**

I want to end with a couple of additional—and I hope practical—suggestions for approaching research. From a practicing librarian's point of view, the most effective way to look for research topics may be for a group of librarians to identify cooperatively the problems that need to be studied within a region, a state, or at least within an individual library, establish priorities for these research needs, and look at how small, manageable, affordable projects might fit into the picture.

One of the first steps in this approach would be to bring together the bits and pieces of what has already been done and to disseminate this information to all those who might want to become involved in research. Then, as new studies are undertaken, their progress can be monitored and their results fed back into the summary of what we know, thereby redefining what we need to know.

Another suggestion I want to make is that anytime you find yourself making an assumption about what your library users might want or how they might react to a change in one of your library procedures or programs, stop and think about that assumption; you may have identified a viable research topic.

Douglas Waples, in one of the first guides on how to do research in libraries, said: "To check the worth of assumptions before they are acted upon is the essential purpose of research." He pointed out that research is simply a matter of recognizing and stating doubtful assumptions, gathering evidence to test them, and adding the revised (or supported, as the case may be) assumption to the body of knowledge about librarianship. As Waples said: "Shorn of its academic jargon and complicated machinery, research is merely a name for the look before the leap, which is plain common sense."
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Funding Library Research

Academic librarians who want to do research and need to find grants to support it should consider how funding agents approach decisions on what proposals to finance. Funding agents look for good ideas in their areas of interest. They consider whether the idea is well researched and backed up with a pragmatic plan of action. Other factors include the qualifications of the proposer and the soundness of the budget.

The topic I have been asked to address poses a single question: What makes good library research from a funding point of view? I would like to answer this question with a single sentence.

Now at first hearing, you may think that this sentence provides a simplistic answer, an obvious, common sense response, to which you might feel compelled to reply: "Well, of course. But how do you do it?" In the balance of my remarks, I shall try to explain just that . . . . what is hidden behind the words in this single sentence.

So, what makes good library research from a funding point of view? My response is: A good idea, well researched, with a pragmatic plan of action and reasonable budget, an idea that falls within the funder's area of interest and is to be carried out by a well-qualified person. Now let's dissect that phrase.

A Good Idea

Behind that simple phrase lurks two questions. What is a good idea? And how can I, an academic librarian, come up with one? Do you wake up one morning and bingo, there it is? Perhaps that happens to some people, but for most of us, our ideas derive from the work we are doing and our own experiences. What kinds of information do you need in order to perform your work better?

An example of this is a proposal that came into the Council on Library Resources some time ago from a librarian whose primary responsibility lay in the area of personnel, including such things as recruitment, staff development and training, long-range planning, etc. This person proposed to investigate current approaches and methodologies in the area of training and job analysis, both in selected academic libraries and in private companies. She had tried to implement a job analysis program at her library with some success. But she learned that not many librarians have had experience in this area and that there is a great deal of knowledge on the subject that perhaps has not been suitably adapted for use by libraries.

Bingo, a budding research topic growing out of her own experiences that presumably will, if disseminated properly, be of service to libraries as a whole.

So now that I have an idea, how can I be sure that it's a good one? I think that first I would pose a number of questions to test it:
1. Is the planned result of what I want to do something that my library, or libraries at large, really need? Do other people think we need it? Will it fill a gap or advance the state of knowledge of the profession?
2. Has someone else already done it;
and, if so, is what I plan to do merely duplicative? Or will it improve on what has been done, show it to have been wrong, or merely corroborate what everyone already knows?

Starting with a good idea seems simple, but it is amazing how some people start from other points of view. For example, I received a call from an academic librarian, who said, "I have a sabbatical coming up in 1980, and I'm thinking of some ideas for research that I would like to discuss with you."

"Fine, what are they?"

"Well, I thought I might go to Florence and look at the Italian art libraries there. They have a lot to tell us... ."

When questioned closely, it appeared that the person had been to Florence and had seen some of the libraries and thought they were interesting, which of course they are. But it wasn't clear just what he thought they had to tell us. I replied that money for travel was carefully scrutinized, at which point he broke in and said, "Well, how about the Vatican Library? We have a lot to learn there... ."

To cut a long story short, clearly the caller had an idea: he wanted to go to Italy. In fact, funders often get proposals for research that are rather thinly disguised attempts to finance travel, and seldom do they get funded. It seems to me that this particular person started from the wrong point, the travel plan instead of the good idea.

**WELL RESEARCHED**

To answer the questions I posed earlier brings us to the second part of the phrase: A good idea, well researched. To find out if you have a good idea you'll need to do some preliminary investigation, reading in the literature, talking to your colleagues and mentors, finding out what has been done and how. Funders aren't going to be terrifically impressed with a plan that, in more elegant language of course, says, "Here is what I think is a good idea, but the first step is to find out if anyone else has done it."

Much more to the point will be a statement, supported by factual evidence, that you know the idea is worth pursuing and that you are familiar with the basic bibliography associated with it; that is, that you are in touch or in tune with that aspect of professional knowledge. This will help both you and your plan gain importance in the eyes of funding agents.

**WITH A PRAGMATIC PLAN OF ACTION**

Now we have a good idea, well researched, and here comes the rub. How are you going to carry it out? Many a good idea has failed at this point, because the proposer couldn't develop a reasonable, pragmatic plan.

It may be impossible to put together a schedule of activities in such detail that you know exactly how you will spend every waking moment during the period of the grant. But you must be able to convince the funding agent that you have some idea of what you are getting into and how long it will take to accomplish it, even whether it's possible to accomplish it.

The plan may be flexible and undoubt edly will require some alteration during the project. To a certain extent you may have to follow guidelines set down by the agency. The U.S. Office of Education, for example, must limit its support to projects that will be concluded within a year. But if you say that you are going to publish, within a month, a multivolume set of information that hasn't been written yet, or, conversely, that you will spend seven months putting together a two-page flyer (extreme cases, to be sure), your good idea may lose out.

A relative of mine provided an example here, and I hope he will forgive me for telling this story. He is the registrar at a midwestern university. One day he told me that he had a great idea for automating some sort of process within his office. He went to a funding agent. Later he told me, "You know, Nancy, I guess I thought that if they knew I was a good person and had this great idea, they'd just give me the money and then I would decide what to do with it. But they made me realize that I needed to do a lot more planning before I even knew how much I wanted."

Funders look for a pragmatic plan that has a good chance of producing the desired result.
REASONABLE BUDGET

All right, now we have a good idea, well researched, with a pragmatic plan of action. How much is it going to cost? Underestimating a budget can be just as big a problem as overestimating. And funders are quick to find unnecessary padding. I'm sure many proposal writers feel that funding agents are overly concerned on this point. But dollars are limited, and having the responsibility of stewardship means that funders are going to try and achieve the most gain from those few dollars.

At the same time, I think most funders are reasonable about allowable expenses. We recently suggested to a proposal writer that he revise his budget upwards since he probably couldn’t live in the places suggested on the amount of money he was seeking—unless he was planning on sleeping on the floors of a lot of library reading rooms.

The budget is almost always negotiable in the beginning, and sometimes can be rearranged (although seldom increased) during the project. "Reasonable" is the key word.

WITHIN THE FUNDER’S AREA OF INTEREST

So we have a well-researched idea, a pragmatic plan, and a reasonable budget. Now we come to the real key: Does your idea fall within the funder’s area of interest? This is a key element. Without it you won’t even get a hearing. It is up to the funder to articulate what those areas of interest are, but it is up to you to read that information and avoid wasting both your time and the funder’s by submitting inappropriate ideas, no matter how worthy.

If you are unsure about whether your idea would interest a funding agent, you can easily check either by sending a preliminary letter of inquiry with enough of the plan fleshed out to enable the funder to make a decision or by talking to program and information officers in person before you ever get to the writing stage. I hasten to add that this applies to both government and private funding agents, for it is to everyone’s advantage to cut down on the paperwork.

A WELL-QUALIFIED PERSON

Our dissection is almost complete. We come now to the last phrase, a well-qualified person. How do you show that you are one? This relates in part to where the idea came from in the first place. If it involves your job or what you are doing, clearly you will have relevant experience and can demonstrate that you know whereof you speak.

Funders look at who will be carrying out the research and who will be responsible for the outcome. They will check to see if that person’s credentials make sense in light of the project. Your record as an employee can also bear witness to your capability, conscientiousness, and follow-through. Most funding agencies reserve the right to have outside consultants and knowledgeable persons assist in proposal evaluation.

If you are unknown, quite likely the funder will check with someone who does know you and can attest to your qualifications. But in the end it will be up to you to justify a funder’s choosing you for the job, so committee work, special projects, publications, and relevant professional activities of all kinds can be brought to bear.

I hope that by now I have answered the question put to me: What makes good library research from a funding point of view? A good idea, well researched, with a pragmatic plan of action and reasonable budget, an idea that falls within the funder’s areas of interest, and is to be carried out by a well-qualified person. It is a simple phrase, but it can form the basis for successful research proposals on any library topic.
Publishing Library Research

Beginning with a brief examination of the nature of research, the article discusses how authors decide on the kind of journal to submit a manuscript to and how they write different kinds of articles for different kinds of journals. It next explores the range of journals available, discusses the functions of the editor and the refereeing process, and deals with the problem of unpublished dissertations and reports. Drawing on the author’s experience as editor of The Library Quarterly, the article describes the process of publishing an article from the editor’s receipt of a manuscript to its appearance in an issue of a journal.

How does an author decide where to send an article for publication? How does a researcher write a paper aimed at a particular kind of publication? Where do reports of research submitted to journals fall down? What is the function of the editor with respect to the publication of research? What does the editorial process involve? What can potential authors expect from an editor?

Underlying these questions is a single problem regarded from two points of view. The points of view are those of the author and the editor, and the problem is the formal communication of research results to a scholarly or professional community.

In this paper I discuss only the publication of scholarly, research-based articles in journals. I neglect explicitly and completely the problems of publishing other kinds of articles and books whether described as professional, scholarly, or text. Moreover, the vantage point from which the paper is written is that of an editor in general, and the editor of The Library Quarterly in particular.

The Nature of Research

In passing, I would like to dismiss an idea sometimes expressed to me. It has to do with the nature of research. One does not design research with a view to publication in a particular kind of journal. One can present the results of research in a variety of ways: as a monosyllabic discourse intelligible to a high school football team, for example, or as a complex series of equations covering half a dozen pages that are intelligible only to a handful of scholars scattered in remote corners of the globe.

The research process itself, however, is always designed to investigate a problem in such a way as to obtain evidence that will support one solution over a potentially infinite number of conceivable solutions. It is a process of reducing alternatives, of cutting speculation to the quick; of asking questions and finding testable answers to them.

The questions can be more or less interesting, perceptive, important, practical, or theoretical; and the process of finding answers can be more or less rigorous, can raise more or fewer questions in its turn, and can lead to more or less definite, complete, believable, and useful answers. Yet this is all the process involves: asking inves-
tangible questions, devising ways of finding objective evidence for answering them, and evaluating the evidence obtained to see how good it is and how far it goes in providing appropriate answers. It is a flexible process. There is no formula for doing research. It involves creativity and imagination in thinking up questions and methodologies, and analytic rigor or incisiveness in evaluating evidence.

If research is regarded as a process of asking questions and finding evidence to support answers, it need not be thought of as a mysterious or forbidding or exclusive process although some research will be all three because of the nature of the prior knowledge necessary to understand it, or because of the originality of the investigative approach employed or the complexity of the problem studied. Complex methodologies and elaborate statistical procedures are directed at assuaging the cultivated skepticism of expert judgment when it causes readers to ask of authors: How can you say that? How do you really know that? How sure can you be of what you say? It should be possible for authors to be able to translate for the general reader the rationale for and the significance of their research designs and statistical analyses of data into plain English prose. Authors who cannot do this as occasion requires may be justly accused of not having properly understood what they have done.

**Assessing Completed Research**

Having completed research of some kind, how does one decide how to write it up and then where to send it for publication? Three factors should enter into the decision: (1) an evaluation of the importance of what one has done; (2) a determination of the nature of the audience or audiences one wants to reach; and (3) the requirements of the journals that one judges might be interested in the papers one may prepare. Of course, considerations of these factors are not mutually exclusive.

In arriving at a dispassionate, carefully considered assessment of the value or significance of one’s work, one examines it in the light of certain questions: How important and complex was the problem investigated? How close to matters of practice was it? Were the results fairly complete, firm, and reliable, or were they merely tentative and suggestive? What do their implications seem to be? Into what professional or scholarly fields do they ramify? Was the methodology more interesting than what it was used for or revealed?

One can go on to ask: To whom do I wish to communicate my work? To as many as possible throughout the whole profession? To those working in my own area of practice or of research in librarianship? To those in a related discipline of which I consider myself also to be a member? To a limited scholarly community able to assess my work on its merits as research? Or to fellow workers in particular kinds of library environments? To a general, intelligent, well-informed community at large for whom my work may be of interest?

Answers to these questions lead one to decide on the kind of journal one may wish to publish in: a popular, practical professional journal or a general or specialized scholarly one; a scholarly journal in a related field or a journal of a general nature. The choice of an audience and the consequent choice of a journal will determine the kind of article one will try to write and the distance one will try to achieve from the detail of the research in one’s account of it. The latter point is important.

**Kinds of Articles**

Having come to some synthesis of answers to the questions just raised, a researcher asks: What are the kinds of articles that I might try to write?

There could be an account that takes pains to establish comprehensively the links of the work reported to related work, that provides sufficient data to enable replication of its results, or independent corroborative analysis of them. Such an account would lead to a paper with a full scholarly apparatus of footnotes, charts, tables, and so on. One might submit it to *The Library Quarterly* or *College & Research Libraries*.

A brief technical note about one or more aspects of what was done or discovered could be submitted to the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, or *The Communications of the American Society for Computing Machinery*, or the
Journal of Library History. Such notes would keep close to the specifics of the research, and one would try to place such articles in scholarly journals in one's own or related fields.

One could prepare a popular account stressing the interesting aspects of the problem one investigated from a professional or practical point of view and the nature of the results obtained for a regional library journal or Library Journal or American Libraries.

Or one could prepare a general account in which are examined the implications of one's work for higher education, or policy formulation, or local government, or the management of science; this kind of article might appear in Science, Minerva, American Scholar, or Educational Record. Such general articles as these are removed to greater or lesser degrees from the details of research.

Frequently, a single piece of research is made the basis of several papers of the kinds indicated above in order that its results may reach, quite appropriately, different special or general audiences.

Having decided on the nature of the article or articles one wants to write and having identified possible journals of interest, the next step is obvious but all too infrequently followed. One goes to the journals and examines them. This examination will show exactly what kinds of articles the journals carry (general, theoretical, practical, scholarly, popular), how long the articles may be, what format they are expected to be in (a question of headings, form and location of footnotes and references, whether charts and tables and abstracts are used, and so on), and to whom manuscripts are to be sent.

Sometimes such matters are dealt with explicitly in a statement of editorial policy and instructions to contributors; but sometimes inferences are necessary from what has appeared in recent issues.

Some journals will simply return manuscripts that do not meet minimum formal style requirements rather than go through the refereeing process and suffer the delay caused by the author then reworking the manuscript to meet style requirements. Others will return articles to be put into style after the refereeing process has taken place and the manuscript has been provisionally accepted.

Range of Journals

Whatever one decides about the kind of article one wants to write, there is a wide range of journals to receive one's work. This is not always appreciated. Given the number and variety of journals, there is no reason why a paper of any competence should not be published.

Let me illustrate without in any way being comprehensive. There are the ALA journals which are devoted to library functions, kinds of libraries, and library clienteles. Samples of the first are Library Resources & Technical Services (LRTS), RQ, and Journal of Library Automation; of the second, College & Research Libraries, Public Libraries (the old PLA Newsletter), and School Media Quarterly; and, of the third, Top of the News.

There are journals of other library associations or societies whose work is more or less directly related to libraries: Bulletin of the Medical Library Association, Special Libraries, Notes, Journal of Education for Librarianship, the Journal of the American Society for Information Science, American Archivist, and the Papers of the American Bibliographical Society are examples here.

There are journals published by or in association with library schools, such as The Library Quarterly or Journal, Library History, or Drexel Library Quarterly.

Some important journals are published by regional associations or state institutions such as state libraries. Examples here are Illinois Libraries, PNLA Quarterly, and Southeastern Librarian. Though some of the local or regional journals are devoted to gossipy news and public relations, many, such as those I have mentioned among others, publish general articles as well as articles of regional interest. Some like Illinois Libraries have several issues within a year dedicated to directory information or to special subjects, and contributions to the latter kinds of issue are usually by invitation from a special guest editor, but most have issues in which space is available for unsolicited material.

There are several widely circulated popular journals: Library Journal, American Li-
Libraries, and Wilson Library Bulletin. These tend to devote much of their space to news, features, and columns and to have different policies about accepting unsolicited manuscripts.

Apart from local or national journals is a group often overlooked. This group comprises international journals both of a special and a general nature. Examples of the latter are Libri, Unesco Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives Administration (formerly Unesco Bulletin for Libraries), and International Library Review. Examples of the former are International Forum for Information and Documentation, Information Processing and Management (formerly Information Storage and Retrieval), Fontis Artis Musicae (International Association of Music Libraries), and INSPEL: International Journal of Special Libraries.

Recently there has emerged a group of specialized independent or commercial library journals, such as The Journal of Academic Librarianship, On-Line Review, and Library Research; and there is a positive spate of new specialist journals from Haworth Press: Collection Management, Serials Librarian, Public Library Quarterly, Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian, Library and Archival Security, Cataloging and Classification Quarterly, and others advertised but not yet issued.

Finally, there are journals whose primary focus is not on library or related matters but for which such matters may be of occasional interest: Children's Literature, Journal of Popular Culture, or Communications of the American Society for Computing Machinery, for example.

Historical articles could be submitted not only to The Library Quarterly or Journal of Library History but to the American Historical Review or regional historical society journals. Articles on women in librarianship could be submitted to feminist journals such as Signs.

The identification of potential outlets for an article can be a matter of considerable ingenuity, and some thought can lead an author to stimulating discoveries about journals and audiences. A useful guide to the variety of library-related journals is the FID List of Library, Documentation and Archives Serials.\(^1\) A comprehensive and thoughtful survey of American library journals from a historic perspective appears in J. Periam Danton's "The Library Press."\(^2\)

All the journals mentioned will publish papers in which the results of research are reported and many of them have similar interests and will be in competition for the same articles. Nevertheless, they tend to have different style requirements, and potential contributors should become sensitive to their special subject focuses and the kinds of audience they attempt to reach, matters to which inspection of several copies gives most of the necessary clues.

THE ROLE OF THE EDITOR

Having decided to send an article to a particular journal, what can the author expect from the editor? What does the editor do when an article appears on the desk? In the pages that follow I will tend to draw examples from and comment on practices at The Library Quarterly.

At the outset I should say that most editors of scholarly journals are not interested in preliminary inquiries from authors about submitting articles. They prefer receiving a completed manuscript. They expect that manuscripts will arrive on their desks unannounced. If they are like me, they wait eagerly for the day's mail to see what it will bring. All a letter of inquiry can do is suggest that an article is likely to be in scope; but even this is difficult to ascertain without a full text to go on. The author's best preparation is to examine issues of the journal he or she is interested in before deciding to send in an article.

In the case of certain widely circulating popular journals, however, a preliminary letter to sound out the editor's interest is probably wise, and often these kinds of journals will suggest this practice to potential contributors in a notice published in the journal. Otherwise such letters waste everyone's time.

The editor's first decision is an answer to the question: Is the article in scope? An editor worth his or her salt does not ask as the first question: Who is the author? Anyone, for example, can submit a manuscript to The Library Quarterly. Of concern to me as editor is the quality of the article, nothing else. Articles come in from practitioners
In the field, library school faculty, and students and scholars in nonlibrary fields; but I have no interest in who contributors are, what their institutional affiliations may be or whether they come decked out in a doctorate or a library directorship or in more humble academic or professional weeds.

In deciding if an article is in scope, the editor must have in mind a clear and steady idea of what kind of a journal he or she is editing. Let me give a general description of The Library Quarterly prepared by one of my predecessors to be sent to potential contributors:

Since its inception in January 1931, LQ has been dedicated to the publication of reports of research, but discussions of problems and issues in librarianship and solid descriptive articles are also accepted if they are based on evidence and the synthesis of data rather than on conjecture and unsupported personal opinion. Descriptions of purely local, institutional, and operational experiments are acceptable if they lend themselves to broad generalization and adoption.

Until recently, The Library Quarterly was the only really general, entirely scholarly American library journal though now the new Library Research shares many of its major objectives. As to scope, let me give a description that I myself prepared some time ago:

Among The Library Quarterly's areas of interest are the organization and management of libraries, the analysis and use of subject literatures, all aspects of bibliographical organization and control, studies of users' needs, reading, publishing, and most problems of information dissemination and use.

Having decided that an article is in scope, the editor decides to have it refereed or to reject it at once. The editor rejects outright manuscripts whose subject and treatment are inappropriate to his or her journal. I have been sent short stories, for example. Some time ago I received a delightful, rather rhapsodic effusion about the effects of the New York Public Library on a sensitive mind. I read such pieces because they are usually interesting, and then reject them, as delicately as I can, as completely out of scope.

Other manuscripts are no less clearly unacceptable. One of the first I received upon becoming editor was a one-page abstract of a dissertation about children's books in Mexico that the author thought I would be delighted to publish. I wrote back suggesting that the author draw a proper article from the dissertation, first looking at some issues of The Library Quarterly to see what kinds of articles we publish. I received a three-page abstract by way of reply and summarily rejected it.

I should say that the decision to proceed to the refereeing process or not, at least in the case of The Library Quarterly, is based on the principle of slightest doubt. If there is the slightest doubt about a paper, I send it to referees; and about 95 percent of articles received are refereed. All articles published are refereed.

REFEREEING

Refereeing is a process of submitting a paper to impartial, expert critical judgment. The refereeing process is crucial. On it depends the quality of research that is published, and it is as a result of this process that scholars lay claim to their reputations (and journals to their role and stature) in a field. I stress here that I speak of scholarly reputation as opposed to professional reputation which may turn on work in ALA, for example, or the innovative management of a library.

No aspect of a paper is too minor for the referees' scrutiny, but mostly they attempt to assess the importance of the problem studied, the appropriateness of the methodology used, and the validity of the conclusions drawn from the data.

The refereeing process allows editors to transcend the inevitable limitations of their own knowledge and understanding, and to find peers for a paper regardless of its subject; that is, individuals who know what has already been written on the subject, who can assess the relevance and potential impact of the article under study, and who have special methodological expertise or professional experience against which to evaluate it.

Editors choose as referees those whom they believe to be expert in the subject or methodology of a particular paper. Referees are usually drawn from the professional and academic communities at large or from editorial boards made up of members of
these communities. They tend to accept refereeing assignments as part of their general professional responsibilities and usually obtain no reward but the knowledge of their contribution to the quality of the articles published in the field. Usually they are sent guidelines to assist them in their assessment of a paper and a form on which to respond. Ziman has described the referee as the "lynchpin about which the whole business of science is pivoted." 3

Referees are no less, perhaps they are more, important in a professional field like librarianship, where there is little or no consensus about the nature or value of a characteristic scholarship and where the research base is broad and ill-defined.

Refereeing is usually anonymous. The referees are not given the authors' names, nor are the authors given the names of the referees. There has been debate as to the value of anonymity. 4 It can be argued that attempts to preserve the anonymity of authors are unlikely to be successful.

A good editor will choose as referees for a particular paper those most competent to judge it. Those most competent to judge it, however, will be active in the area of the paper's subject and likely, therefore, to be able to guess or, from internal clues, to know definitely who the author is. Their own anonymity, as far as the author is concerned, may allow them to give rein to professional prejudice or jealousy. Released from the responsibility of having to defend or account for their views, the argument runs, they can be nasty or capricious. Those who are less likely to know who the author is are also likely to be less competent in their evaluation of a paper's significance or contribution.

These kinds of problems are seriously discussed in science, but fortunately, given the nature of the field, they can generally be discounted in librarianship, though an editor should always be alert to the possibility of such difficulties arising.

In the case of The Library Quarterly I usually choose two referees for a paper, but I have sent a paper to as many as four or five, and, indeed, have returned papers to one or more referees for further assessment in light of the comments of other referees.

On the basis of the referees' reports, the editor decides whether to accept or reject the paper. This itself is not simple because the opinions of referees often conflict. I had one case recently where one referee thought that the paper involved should be shortened to a few polemical pages and submitted to another journal; another thought that tightened up a bit and more carefully argued, the paper should be accepted; and a third, proceeding to sit on the fence, said cautiously that it was not without merit.

The range of decisions that can be made are: (1) to accept; (2) to accept provisionally pending certain specified revisions; (3) to suggest general, usually major revision and resubmission; or (4) to reject.

An editor can reject a paper in several ways: outright, perhaps by a form letter, or by suggesting other places where it might be submitted. Sometimes editors reject papers without giving reasons for their decision, in order perhaps to avoid the possibility of disagreeable wrangling. My own practice is to indicate in a general way why I have decided that a paper is unsuitable. This seems an appropriate response to a colleague who has, in a sense, asked for judgment. Moreover, the editor has the referees' comments to offer, and these can be used to indicate that the decision is not personal, is not the editor's "fault" as it were. Of course, the editor has the final say, even if only by silence.

Revision

Acceptance of manuscripts is usually contingent on revision. I used to be astonished at how badly written or presented or developed most papers, especially nonhistorical papers, are in our field.

The reasons for this are many, no doubt, but one of the major ones is a lack in librarianship of a tradition of cumulative research, a tradition that in the sciences and social sciences has tended to prescribe the form papers take. Our research is so various, so fragmented, draws on so many methodologies and disciplines that scholars are bound to be confused as to what is appropriate in the presentation of their work. Moreover, often a writer publishes only one major work drawn from a dissertation or thesis, and so does not through prac-
I might say that recently a paper was published in The Library Quarterly, the preparation of which began two Library Quarterly editors ago with an entire dissertation. The process of revision was slow and was carried out over half a dozen versions of the paper. While this is an extreme case, two or three versions are not unusual.

While revision ultimately leads to an article judged substantively acceptable by the referees, it is also a process of meeting standards of scholarly communication and, indeed, of intelligible communication generally. Resolved here are problems in logic, the presentation of evidence, and the textual organization of the paper.

In asking for revisions or even in rejecting a paper, the editor draws on the referees' reports in various ways. Sometimes they are returned to the author verbatim though as I indicated earlier, usually anonymously; sometimes they are excerpted in a general letter; sometimes they serve as the basis for detailed commentary by the editor on the text of the paper. In all of this, the editor is perhaps more closely involved with the author's text than is the case in many better-established scholarly fields.

Editing in librarianship, at least in my own view and in terms of my practice at The Library Quarterly, is rather more than providing a switching mechanism between a manuscript, the referees' judgments of quality, and the technical aspects of publishing. I see it as partly a collegial and partly an educational process, a dialogue which culminates in the editor finally giving a firm "yes, acceptable" or "no, unacceptable" to the author.

THESES, DISSERTATIONS, AND REPORTS

Doctoral dissertations, master's theses, and reports of funded research and demonstration projects of various kinds, in which much of the research in the field is recorded, present a range of problems for author and editor alike in the preparation of articles drawn from them.

The dissertation is a record of expertise achieved as well as embodying a contribution to our knowledge. In the dissertation the student must show that he or she has read a considerable body of relevant literature and has understood and employed correctly appropriate research techniques. The dissertation chronicles false as well as correct moves. It is a document which must satisfy a committee.

In an article, evidence of accumulating expertise is not required. An article is not a report of an educational experience. It sets out a problem, a method of investigation, and results. To achieve the apparent directness, characteristic brevity, and simplicity of an article from the painstaking discursiveness of most dissertations requires a careful reassessment of what was of most importance in what was done and the sacrifice of many pages of prose that were often completed by the student at a great cost of suffering. What in all of the apparatus of a dissertation is its contribution to knowledge is the question that must be answered.

It is a matter of regret to me that many who graduate with the doctorate or prepare fine master's theses or papers do not submit themselves to this discipline. As an editor, I see as one of my major tasks the encouragement of such persons to meet a serious professional and academic obligation to report what they discover.

Similar comments can be made about research reports which are usually prepared to satisfy the requirements of funding agencies. The format of these reports is sometimes prescribed by the funding agencies themselves. Reports are usually detailed and discursive, and, where there have been interim or progress reports, either subsequent reports do not stand fully alone or they incorporate much that has already appeared in the earlier or preliminary form. They are not only reports of research, they are accounting documents in which the expenditure of sums of money of various amounts is defended.

In this respect, they are not necessarily dispassionate so much as drawn up clearly on the one hand to justify the expenditures made and frequently to make evident, on the other, the need for future funding of a continuation of the research reported. Like dissertations and theses, then, the formal functions of research reports are complex and different from the functions of articles. The comparative brevity of the articles
drawn from them (though some reports, like some dissertations and theses, are revised and published in extenso as books) is symptomatic of the difference, and in preparing articles from research reports, authors must ask themselves similar questions to those asked by students revising theses and dissertations, and they must submit themselves to similar disciplines.

It is important to realize that dissertations and reports of the kind mentioned here are not formally published. They have not been through the general sifting, evaluative process that is now commonly accepted as necessary for achieving "public knowledge" in a discipline. They have not been prepared for and submitted to general professional scrutiny and approval beyond particular universities or funding bodies. They are usually neither refereed in the professional community at large, nor reviewed by it upon production, though dissertations must satisfy examiners and reports must be accepted by funding agencies.

In terms of adding to our knowledge, they tend to represent a job half done. As useful as bibliographical tools and retrieval systems of various kinds are in allowing us to become aware of the existence of, and to have access to, the text of dissertations and reports, the contribution of dissertations and reports to professional knowledge is not complete until they are published either as articles or books.

COMMON DEFICIENCIES OF PAPERS

What are the major problems that appear in papers? They are just what one might expect and are covered in every textbook on research methodology and in every course on the same subject: poor problem definition, methodological inadequacies (especially in sampling), badly constructed instruments such as questionnaires, erroneously applied statistical procedures, inappropriate inferences from data, and what, in a general way, I call bad flow (the progression of a paper's argument, its logical organization, and unfolding).

What makes a good paper? Avoiding the problems I have just identified, of course. But the question can best be answered by a series of other questions that the author should address to his or her paper, and that the editor most certainly will address to it.

Is an interesting problem clearly identified? Why is it of interest? Is it placed in an appropriate context both in terms of the subject area of which the problem is part and in terms of relevant literature and research? Does the author make clear what the research was intended to accomplish, and, related to this, does he or she indicate at the end how successful the research was and what the nature of the reservations are that one must bear in mind in understanding what was accomplished?

Is an appropriate methodology described in sufficient detail for results deriving from it to be intelligible to a technically competent reader? Are sufficient data presented to allow the reader to understand what was found? Are the data properly discussed and analyzed? Does the paper flow clearly and logically from one point to another? That is to say, is there an easily grasped organization to the major sections or intellectual components of the paper?

It is at this point that I want to return to my rather bold claim that sophisticated research designs and highly complex technical methodologies can be dealt with in plain English prose. I always ask myself, no matter how technical a paper is, if the author has indicated in terms intelligible to a reasonably well-informed (but technically incompetent) reader such as myself, what was found as a result of the methodology and what is the significance of the findings.

I recently returned a paper that presented an abstract mathematical model asking for just such explanations. It should be possible for us all, no matter how mysterious the middle sections of a paper may be, to understand quite clearly its beginning and end. Nor should one interpret this as a kind of condescension. The explanations should be thorough and thoughtful and as lengthy as necessary.

SCHEDULING FOR PUBLICATION

Having decided to accept an article, the editor has then to schedule it for publication. This can be easy if he or she has few articles and works from issue to issue or if articles are published strictly in order of acceptance. As a matter of policy, I try to make each issue of The Library Quarterly...
balanced in terms of subjects and methodological approaches represented in the articles. In this way, I think I indicate partly my own view of librarianship and partly what kind of a periodical I think The Library Quarterly should be. There are problems in the heterogeneity that results, and the suggestion has been made by members of my editorial board and by other colleagues that The Library Quarterly ought to be more precisely focused. My own view is that a number of good specialist library journals already exist, and I have indicated earlier something of the variety of these journals, all of which publish research to a greater or lesser degree. But to repeat myself, there is no general scholarly journal in the U.S. other than The Library Quarterly which can accommodate long articles over the whole field of librarianship supported by a full scholarly apparatus.

**COPY EDITING**

Once articles are assigned to an issue, they have to be prepared for the press. This is the process of copy editing. Some editors will have to do this for themselves. Fortunately for me, The Library Quarterly is one of over forty journals published by the University of Chicago Press, one of the largest scholarly publishers in the English-speaking world.

Copy editing is carried out at the press by experts. Their purpose is to prepare the manuscript so that technically it conforms to the style and standards of the press.

The manuscript is returned to me from the copy editors marked up so that the printers will know exactly how it is to appear in type and also with questions to the authors and to me. Because of the size and range of journal publishing done by the press, the process of copy editing is carried out with an almost unbelievable professional skill. Footnotes, tables, headings, and the text itself are all examined in the minutest detail. Inconsistencies, contradictions, obscurities of style or reference that I miss, my assistant misses, the author has missed, or that we did not know existed until they were pointed out are caught, questioned, or corrected by the copy editors.

One of the reasons for the stature of The Library Quarterly as a scholarly journal is this extraordinary care that goes into its physical, textual preparation which, through the copy editors, extends far beyond the scope of the things my colleagues on the editorial board and I do. I make the major decisions about what will be published and how the text generally will appear. The copy editors attend to all the minutiae, the myriad detail that must be exactly right if the highest standards of excellence in the presentation of the text are to be met.

Once copy edited, the manuscript has to be checked. Most journals are set in type after copy editing and galley proofs of articles are pulled and sent to authors for checking. Because of our publication schedules we do not send out galleys. I answer what questions I can for the copy editors and then return the copy-edited manuscripts to the authors who answer the questions asked by me or the copy editors and check the text of their manuscript to see that they approve of any changes introduced by us. They do not see the copy again until it is published.

**PUBLICATION**

The Library Quarterly galleys are checked in my office by my assistant and a student hired for the purpose. One reads from the copy-edited manuscript, the other checks the galley. The corrected galley is returned to the press with any questions that occur to us now that we see the paper in type. The galley is then returned to the printer who pulls page proofs. Page proofs are then checked to see that the corrections marked on the galleys have been made by the printer. Once the page proofs are corrected and passed, final printing begins. We receive an inspection copy of The Library Quarterly before the loose pages are bound into the covers. This allows us to make sure everything looks all right. At this stage we once caught an error in volume numbering for an issue! Then binding is completed and the journal mailed out to subscribers.

**CONCLUSION**

Let me summarize what I think the functions of the editor are in the publication of research in librarianship. The editor is both a guardian of, and an agent to assist in,
scholarly professional communication.

Most simply put, the editor's function is to work with authors as closely as necessary to achieve acceptable papers. First, the editor must be alert to research in progress or completed and encourage the formal reporting of that portion of it of interest to the journal he or she edits. Second, the editor must encourage the fullest, most thorough and authoritative evaluation possible of the reported research through the refereeing process. Third, the editor must guide authors in meeting the highest standards of scholarly communication in the presentation of the reported research.

Editors are anonymous sorts of people. They should be supportive, critical, sensitive to what is being presented, and they should be aware of and insist on the highest possible standards. They react to what others do. In a most important sense their work is not creative. The cumulative record of the journal they guide, usually for a limited period of years, represents standards, provides models, may influence aspirations, may even help define a field. But ultimately good research depends on the imagination, the training, and the dedication to scholarly ideals of researchers and the authors they become when they carry out their obligation to communicate the results of their work. The editor is there to help.
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Open Stacks and Library Performance

Although the utility of open stack systems has been widely debated, little empirical research relevant to the controversy is available. Using circulation, book availability, and search and library-use statistics, major elements of the direct access debate are tested in a six-year study of a library that has recently undergone the transition from closed to open stacks. Direct shelf access, it was found, contributed to an increase in library use and a decrease in circulation. Contrary to expectations, book availability performance also improved significantly during the study period.

DIRECT COLLECTION ACCESS is a prevailing practice in American academic libraries today and enjoys considerable support among faculty members, students, and librarians. Despite their popularity, open stack systems have not been incontrovertibly proven more effective than the closed or semiclosed alternatives as user access mechanisms. Nor is the ongoing debate likely to resolve the issue, since the discussion is largely impressionistic and speculative.

Considerable research on patron behavior is available. However, the few quantitative studies relevant to the controversy focus on user behavior in the stacks rather than the broader issue of open access per se. Inferences about the validity of open stack systems have been drawn from measures of patron shelf failure and browsing effectiveness in these reports.

The effectiveness of direct access could be established from statistical case studies comparing library performance before and after the stacks were opened. However, no such empirical impact studies were identified in a search of Library Literature.

The opening of the main library stacks at West Virginia University in February 1976 provided an opportunity for such a longitudinal analysis. Complete circulation, building use, and search statistics had been kept during the three-year periods preceding and following the opening of the stacks. Moreover, book availability studies had been conducted during peak use periods before and after the decision. Access to this body of data made possible a study of library performance, using several dependent variables, under changing conditions of shelf access.

THE ISSUE

The debate over open stacks is multifaceted, encompassing such diverse issues as the effectiveness of browsing, the value of close classification, storage policy, the educational role of the library, and collection security. It also reflects various conceptions of the patron/collection interface articulated by librarians during the past 150 years.

Closed stack libraries were predominant in Europe until the post-World War II period, with books shelved in accession order or by size. This arrangement conserved shelf space and made detailed subject classification unnecessary.

The demand for general access to the shelves originated in the mid-1800s, largely as an outgrowth of the public library movement. The concept was consonant with democratic theory and was adopted by many college libraries and some university libraries, though most of the large research collections in this country remained closed or semiclosed until well into the twentieth century.1

In recent decades, however, most academic library buildings have been designed to support open stack operations,
and many libraries have liberalized access despite architectural shortcomings. In the latter case, the decision has often been made without full advance appreciation of its consequences.  

Many theoretical and practical arguments have been advanced in favor of open access. In a survey conducted in the 1950s, Hicks found widespread expectations that an open stack system would eliminate unnecessary barriers between readers and the collection, increase circulation, permit staff reductions, and elicit patron support. 2 In his chapter “The Educational Function of the Library,” Lyle concluded that “open stacks makes [sic] possible the intelligent use of library resources,” assuming good library management and faculty promotion of systematic library research. 3 Celoria, an archaeologist, maintained that researchers can remain abreast of advances in sister disciplines by mastering the “higher browsing.” 4 Other advocates of direct access insist that it enhances human dignity and produces a variety of other social benefits.

An equally impressive set of arguments has been arrayed against the open stack concept. The most familiar of these are custodial in origin—increases in theft and mutilation, reduced book availability due to misshelving, greater costs for book replacements and staff, inadequacies of building design, and inefficient use of shelf space. 5 Criticism has also been advanced at a loftier theoretical level. Ratcliffe and others, expanding upon the conventional argument that students cannot function well in an open stack system, maintain that open access encourages users to bypass the card catalog and other bibliographic tools. The consequence of this tendency, they continue, is to impair the library’s performance of its educational role by fostering a decline in bibliographic research skills and systematic library use. 6

A second argument, applicable particularly to large research libraries, is that the utility of browsing in a classified shelf arrangement varies in a roughly inverse manner with collection size. Drawing upon search theory, Morse inferred that browsing has its own law of diminishing returns:

The trouble comes when the collection becomes too large for all of it to be easily accessible to all, or when even one class becomes so large that it cannot be scanned efficiently in a fraction of an hour. 8

Ratcliffe contended that a classified subject arrangement is helpful to the browser only in a small or medium-size library. He identified the University of Manchester, with holdings exceeding one million items in 1969, as a library that has passed this size threshold and is gradually restricting patron access to its collection. 9 This argument is also supported by Hyman’s finding that most librarians consider shelf classification more valuable as a locational device than for subject searches. 10

Common to all these contributions, both pro and con, is a virtual absence of empirical data to support the authors’ contentions. Factual data relevant to the controversy must be sought elsewhere.

**Previous Research Results**

Although the open access question is addressed indirectly in many user behavior studies, Cooper’s 1957 article remains the only analysis of the impact upon library performance of a transition to open stacks. While generally supportive of the University of Washington’s decision, her report does identify several dysfunctional consequences of the decision, including increases in misshelved books, searches, and noise in the stacks and initial dissatisfaction among undergraduates accustomed to book delivery service. Improved patron service and greater long-term user satisfaction, a result attributed to the opportunity to browse, are cited as benefits of the decision. 11

Several interrelated factors account for book availability performance. Buckland reported that a variable loan policy and demand-based selection of duplicate copies produced a sharp increase in book availability at the University of Lancaster. 12 Saracevic, Shaw, and Kantor found that circulation performance at Case Western Reserve University improved from 77 percent to 87 percent after the loan period was shortened. 13

The effectiveness of library security measures, whether manual or electronic, is an important determinant of a library’s ability to deliver books when requested. Confirming a principal finding of the Case Western
Reserve study, Smith and Granade discovered that 14 percent of the titles not located by patrons in the University of Tennessee’s Undergraduate Library were in their proper shelf locations. This last finding is particularly germane to the open-access debate, since it demonstrates that undergraduates encounter some difficulty with classified shelf arrangements even in medium-size libraries.

Studies of stack use at the Library of Congress, the University of Chicago’s Harper Library, and Johns Hopkins University indicate that collection size does not deter browsing in an open-stack research library. Dubester reported that 35 percent of the individuals interviewed in the Library of Congress stacks were browsing rather than searching for specific titles. Data from Fussier and Simon’s Chicago study revealed that 56 percent of the history and physics books removed from their shelf locations had been identified through browsing. In a follow-up of the Fussier and Simon study, Bowen found that many more books were browsed than checked out, with graduate students comprising the bulk of the open shelf user population. The Johns Hopkins study conducted in the early 1960s confirmed that many items wanted by patrons are initially located through browsing.

The real utility of browsing is questioned in Greene’s study of methods used by Georgia Tech faculty members to select books from the library. Greene found that browsing was the most frequently cited method for locating books that were subsequently borrowed. However, browsing was also the least effective method for identifying books that ultimately proved useful.

The potential difficulty of user adaptation from an open stack system to closed stacks is raised by a study conducted at the University of North Carolina. Clay reported that 80 percent of a faculty/graduate student sample interviewed in the stacks felt unable to rely on catalogs and bibliographies as a substitute for browsing.

The studies cited above indicate that users will browse in an open stack library, do locate some books specifically through browsing, and do value direct access to the shelves. Conversely, increased shelf disorder and search failures in a classified collection are identified as counterproductive results of open stack access.

Collection access questions should not, however, be regarded as strictly technical questions that can be resolved in a political vacuum. The University of Toronto Library confronted the latent power of its student and faculty clienteles in 1972, when an attempt to institute a closed-stack policy in a new university library precipitated student demonstrations and critical responses from the Canadian library community. Faculty members and students, it should be recognized, constitute interest groups able to define broad parameters within which shelf access decisions can be made.

HYPOTHESES

Certain conceptions about the consequences of open access reappear in both philosophical discussions of the idea and the small body of relevant empirical literature. In particular, one encounters predictions that circulation will increase, while book availability will decline. The anticipated direction of user reaction varies with individual preferences, with advocates of open access predicting increased user satisfaction and opponents forecasting a decline. All of these implicit propositions are susceptible to empirical testing. The decision to open the stacks at West Virginia University’s (WVU) main library provided an opportunity to reformulate these ideas as testable propositions and to examine their validity under real-life conditions.

The main library contains approximately 530,000 of the 930,000 physical volumes in the WVU collection. Books in the humanities and social sciences constitute the bulk of the collection, since science materials are concentrated in several branch libraries. The stack area was semi-closed prior to February 1976, with admission restricted to faculty members, graduate students with stack permits, and a few undergraduate honors students. The stacks were opened with minimal publicity, on an “experimental” basis, to permit close monitoring of the decision’s impact on library services and to avoid abrupt changes in use patterns. Book delivery service was main-
tained for those patrons preferring not to retrieve their own books.

Somewhat controlled conditions for analysis existed during the six-year study period, since no branch libraries were opened and no policy changes that might have affected study results were implemented. Enrollment increased from 15,203 in 1973 to 20,964 in 1978, but allowances for this change have been made in the analysis.

The availability of comparable data for the 1973-78 period permits both the testing of propositions derived from the literature and the investigation of a possible relationship between stack access and library use levels. For purposes of analysis, these propositions are presented in the form of three testable hypotheses:

1. Book circulation will increase if patrons are given greater access to library stack areas.

2. If patrons are given greater access to library stack areas, book availability rates will decline:
   a. More books will be unavailable when requested.
   b. Book losses through theft will increase.

3. If greater patron access to library stack areas is permitted, use of the library building will increase.

The results of this analysis, it is assumed, will have both theoretical and practical significance. On a theoretical plane, the study should contribute to the development of user behavior theory by explaining patron behavior under changed conditions of collection access. It should also benefit library decision makers by providing a reliable empirical foundation from which decisions regarding patron access to the stacks can be formulated.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The hypothesis that circulation levels should increase with open access derives from the assumption that users will borrow more books if they are permitted to browse, rather than having their access limited to specific books identified through bibliographic tools.

Given the substantial growth in enrollment during the study period, circulation would be expected to increase even without a change in stack access. Table 1, however, reveals a decline in nonreserve circulation throughout the study period. This decline is sharpest in 1976 and 1977, the first two years after the decision to open the stacks.

The decrease is less abrupt when we control for building use loans, a type of transaction that logically occurs with greater frequency in a closed stack system, but a decline of nearly 8,000 loans is found for 1976 even when building use data are excluded from the analysis. (The building loan category includes books returned across the circulation desk that have not been checked out. It excludes books reshelved by patrons, books left on tables or carrels in the stacks and reshelved directly by library personnel, and reserve books.)

Clearly hypothesis 1 must be rejected. This unanticipated decline in circulation would seem most readily explicable as a consequence of reduced book availability or declining building use. Both explanations can be tested with data derived from the study.

The book availability explanation can be

---

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Nonreserve Circulation</th>
<th>Building Loans</th>
<th>Circulation excluding Building Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>194,899</td>
<td>45,143</td>
<td>149,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>192,520</td>
<td>46,068</td>
<td>146,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>185,593</td>
<td>43,355</td>
<td>142,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976*</td>
<td>167,167</td>
<td>32,832</td>
<td>134,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>149,647</td>
<td>16,176</td>
<td>133,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>146,949</td>
<td>14,277</td>
<td>132,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First year of open stacks.
tested with search statistics and data
gathered from book delivery studies con-
ducted at several intervals in the 1973-78
period. Search statistics, shown in table 2,
obviously do not explain the decline in cir-
culation, since a decline in the number of
searches was reported in the second and
third years of open stacks. The high number
of searches conducted in 1976 appears to be
the culmination of a long-term trend that
was reversed after the stacks were opened.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Searches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>3775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976*</td>
<td>4471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First year of open stacks.

Since hours of shelf reading remained rela-
tively constant throughout the study pe-
riod, the reduction in searches in 1977 and
1978 can probably be attributed to students' willingness to "settle" for an alternative
book on a particular topic when their first
choice was not on the shelf. Thus, while the
decrease in searches does not in itself
demonstrate an improvement in book
availability, it suggests that the collocation
of related books on the shelf helped satisfy
the needs of many browsing patrons.

A more meaningful measure of book availability in an open stack system can be
obtained by comparing book delivery rates
longitudinally. Since the main library did
continue to provide book delivery service at
the circulation desk even after opening the
stacks, delivery success data are available
for several peak use periods. The results of
three statistically comparable studies con-
ducted during the 1973-78 period are sum-
marized in table 3.

Since patrons who have searched unsuccess-
fully for a book in the stacks may also
present call slips at the circulation desk, one
would expect a deteriorating delivery rate
after the stacks were opened even if shelf
order remained constant. Instead, table 3
reveals a mild improvement in the percent-
age of books delivered. This finding indi-
cates even more conclusively than the
search statistics in table 2 that the library's
book delivery performance was not impaired
by the adoption of open access.

Although the question of building use has
not been raised previously in the literature,
it was assumed that direct access would
make the library more attractive to users,
thereby contributing to increased use of the
facility.

Table 4 confirms that building use did in-
crease dramatically after the opening of the
stacks, and particularly in the second year of
the new system. This upsurge in building
use cannot be attributed to the increase in
enrollment during the study period, given a
simultaneous decrease in circulation figures.
This interpretation of the data is
strengthened by the finding of significantly
increased library use in 1976, the first year
of the open stack system and a year in
which enrollment actually declined.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

These findings conflict with the conven-
tional assumption that open stack systems
contribute to increased circulation and a de-
cline in book availability. Instead, a decline
in circulation and a mild increase in book
availability were found in the three-year pe-
riod following the initiation of direct access
at West Virginia University. A sharp in-
crease in building use was also observed.
Taken together, these findings both chal-

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Study</th>
<th>Percent Delivered</th>
<th>Percent Not Delivered but Accounted For*</th>
<th>Percent Not Accounted For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1974</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1977</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1978</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes books in circulation, reserve books, materials at bindery, branch library titles, patron errors in recording call numbers, etc.
The improvement in book delivery performance indicates that unrestricted patron access does not invariably produce increases in misshelved books and theft if proper precautions are being taken. Close supervision of shelf readers and conscientious checks at the security desk clearly kept the adverse effects of direct shelf access to a minimum.

Increases in shelf reading and stack patrolling are essential in libraries undergoing the transition to open stacks, since many users will misshelve books inadvertently and some do it deliberately, thereby denying access to other potential users. Shifts of personnel from the circulation desk to stack duty may also be required. Since a tight student assistant budget did not permit these adjustments at WVU, meticulous supervision of shelf readers and conscientious security checks were used to minimize the adverse effects of direct shelf access.

The findings of increased building use and decreased circulation suggest that an important change in user search behavior occurs once the stacks have been opened. Specifically, it appears that after the stacks have been opened users increasingly make relevance decisions at the shelf, rather than borrowing a large number of books with the hope of finding something useful. If this conclusion is correct, improvements in book availability are partially attributable to greater patron selectivity, a tendency that is encouraged by direct access to the collection. If this is the case, and the increase in building use suggests that it is, declines in circulation after the stacks have been opened are probably indicative of improved library service.

The concurrent findings of increased building use and declining circulation also suggest that user adaptation to an open stack system is a generational phenomenon. Library use rises and circulation decreases, it appears, until a plateau is reached when the majority of the student body has been exposed only to a direct-access system.

Initial dissatisfaction with the opening of their exclusive domain may also be expressed initially by faculty members and graduate students, but this discontent can likewise be expected to subside over time. Several important issues in the shelf access debate are not addressed in this analysis. The study does not, for example, provide any clear evidence whether open stack systems facilitate reader access to particular books, save money, or promote the educational function of the library. However, this study does indicate that, with proper managerial anticipation of shifting use patterns, the stacks can be opened in a medium-size academic facility with significant benefits for individual patrons and without adversely affecting overall library performance.
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Several surveys over the past twenty-five years have documented the failure of modern businesses systematically to preserve their historically significant records. If such records are to be preserved, therefore, it may fall to universities to become more aggressively involved in collecting. This article summarizes results of a survey designed to determine which universities are collecting business records, how they began, and what problems they have encountered. After assessing the experience of these institutions, it suggests an acquisitions strategy to overcome the problems associated with collecting business records.

Business history as an academic discipline is relatively new; so too are business archives. N. S. B. Gras introduced business history to Harvard University in 1927, where he pioneered the case-study approach in his graduate courses. Business archives in the United States are an even more recent development, beginning with the appointment of William Overman as archivist for the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company in 1943.

Both developments were a belated recognition of the increasing importance of understanding business history in order to understand American history. Archivists, whose responsibility it is to document human activity, are properly concerned that business activity be documented, but the record of performance over the last two decades indicates that not enough is being done. Problems apparently continue to out-run solutions.1

Several surveys, conducted between 1955 and 1976 by individual researchers and the Business Archives Committee of the Society of American Archivists, indicate the dimensions of the problem of documenting business activity. Historically significant business records are usually kept either by businesses themselves or by independent archival repositories, such as historical societies or universities. Businesses apparently think so little of their historical records that most large corporations neither employ an archivist nor have even an elemental archival program.

Even using a generous definition of what constitutes a business archives, there were fewer than 200 business archives in the United States and Canada in 1975. While business archives have grown significantly in the past two decades, the actual number is not impressive compared with the number of businesses.2

If businesses themselves are unwilling to establish company archives, then it may fall to colleges and universities to preserve the necessary records. Because of their size, number, influence, variety, and their broad cultural and educational role, colleges and universities may, in fact, be the most logical repositories for business records. They are widely dispersed geographically, making possible regional collections. They have the faculty and staff expertise necessary for developing an acquisitions strategy and for appraising technical records. They have the monographic literature, scholarly journals, and government documents to complement archival sources. They have the business,
economics, and history graduate programs that provide research topics. They have library, archival, and historical agency courses in which students can be trained in archival work using the records as a learning laboratory. They have offices of extramural support to assist in formulating grant proposals to acquire and process these collections.

Even with problems of declining enrollments and revenues, universities may, nevertheless, be the most realistic repositories for documenting American business in the present century.

Most major universities have at least some business records, but the quality, volume, and completeness of those collections vary tremendously. This is true particularly for twentieth-century records of the modern business corporation. Modern business records are dated somewhat arbitrarily from about 1890 or the late nineteenth century, when the size of businesses increased rapidly, when accounting practices became more elaborate, when new office machines contributed to the increased volume of records, when the communication and transportation network stretched across vast areas to make regional and national markets possible, and when the role of government in regulating businesses became substantial. It is particularly the records dating from these changes that document the transformation of business as well as of the larger society.3

SURVEY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Past efforts to assess holdings of business records have focused on archival repositories generally or on businesses themselves. In an attempt to learn what colleges and universities specifically are doing to secure modern business records, sixty-five such institutions in the United States and Canada were queried in 1978.

Institutions were selected from the Society of American Archivists Directory of Individual Members (1978) and were chosen from public and private institutions from all geographic areas, although large universities represent the greatest percentage of those surveyed and also the greatest percentage of those responding.

While questionnaires were sent to university archivists, the cover page noted that the purpose of the survey was to assess the efforts by universities to collect business records, as part of either their university archives, their special collections, or some other unit of the university, such as the business school or history department.4

More than half the respondents indicated that their universities had some business records. The remaining twenty universities had none, and it is worth noting why. The reason cited by most was that they had never seriously considered collecting business records. The second most frequently cited reason was they were not charged with the responsibility for developing collections other than university records. Fewer than half noted that they would accept business records of importance, if offered, but they have not actively sought such records. Surprisingly, in light of the volume of records generated by businesses and, therefore, the possibilities of developing collections, few mentioned that they would be interested in collecting business records if they had adequate staff and facilities.

The remainder of the questionnaire was completed by the thirty institutions that held business records. The information they provide sheds light on three general questions: (1) What kinds of business holdings are currently found in colleges and universities? (2) How and when have institutions begun collecting business records? and (3) What problems have they encountered in acquiring, processing, and making the records available? (See appendix B for the definition for business records and papers used.)

Sizes and Kinds of Collections

In general, business collections comprise less than a quarter of the volume of the holdings of universities that have business records. Although the percentage of busi-

*This survey was conducted in conjunction with a grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission to the University Archives and Area Research Center of the University of Wisconsin–Parkside. Colleges and universities to which questionnaires were sent are listed in appendix A.
ness records varied significantly from institution to institution, only two indicated that more than 50 percent of their holdings are of business. The number of different collections at each institution varies as widely as the percentage of total holdings devoted to business, from a low of 1 to a high of more than 1,400.

Overall it appears that nearly half of those universities with business collections have thirty or more separate business collections. Most major types of businesses are included, and some, such as the lumber, textile, and railroad businesses, are heavily represented in university collections. Less well represented are the records of commercial banks, department stores, and retail and wholesale grocers. Sizes of these collections vary considerably, but several are, indeed, large in volume, representing companies whose records extend into the twentieth century. Most, however, indicated that their records reflected small companies—those with fewer than 100 employees. Slightly more reported that most of their records were of privately held companies, as opposed to publicly held, defined as firms issuing publicly traded stock. The business records of nearly half the institutions centered on family papers of company founders or influential citizens in the community.

In summary, then, current college and university business collections comprise a relatively small portion of total holdings but represent a wide range of business enterprises. Even so, individual business collections tend to be significantly larger than other types of collections, such as those of social organizations, labor unions, or individuals.

Nearly all the institutions began their collections of business records when a collection was offered, rather than after first developing a specific policy on acquiring business records. Most also noted their records were primarily of firms no longer in business.

This suggests that it is easier to acquire records when a firm is defunct or going out of business than while it is still in operation. In fact, one university got its records through an estate lawyer.

For a substantial majority of institutions, business collections were of companies in the same geographic area as the repository. Further, a quarter noted that the records reflected businesses in which the university had strong research or educational programs.

Finally, the same percentage indicated that their initial business collections related to the university, either through its faculty, graduates, board of trustees, or other university contacts. The connection was not always clear, however. In some cases collections reflected the research interests of certain faculty, the business firms of members of the board of trustees, or graduates, or the contacts of chief university administrators with businesses.

Establishing the Collection

Thus, answers to how and when colleges and universities began to build business collections suggest little planning. The first university systematically to collect business records was Harvard University. In 1916, on behalf of the Harvard Business School, Professor Arthur H. Cole secured the Slater Company records, dating from the colonial period. The Universities of Washington, California at Los Angeles, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Virginia, and Cornell were also relatively early collectors of sizable business records. Most of the remainder of the universities collecting business records did not begin until the 1950s or later, and they were the most likely to have begun collecting without plans.

Finally, what problems have colleges and universities met in acquiring, processing, and making available business records? The reason many institutions do not acquire business records is their huge volume and their low research use. One archivist with more than twenty-five years of experience at three different repositories felt that “business records are the lowest grade ore mined by collectors.”

The first obstacle to acquiring business records is either the firm’s unwillingness to deposit records in a repository open to the public or the firm’s lack of understanding about the potential value of its records. Typical reaction indicated that “businesses are reluctant to cooperate with archival institutions because of their suspicions that their records in an archives might be ‘too avail-
Problems related to appraisal were raised by some archivists who felt they did not have the technical expertise to evaluate the records. Difficulties in persuading businesses to donate their records suggest that firms already involved in their own records management programs might be more susceptible to successful solicitation. Yet, almost none of the firms whose records were acquired by universities had had records management programs.

In nearly all cases archivists handled most of the negotiations for acquisition. However, in more than half of the cases, at least some work was done by someone else within the university. Professors of history, economics, and business were the most obvious contacts, although administrators such as development officers, librarians, and attorneys were also involved at some stage of negotiations.

Those who had experience using faculty or administrators generally found them useful, especially for establishing entree and opening negotiations. A significant minority, however, found the third-party contacts troublesome, primarily because such contacts did not understand archival procedures and had not sufficiently coordinated arrangements in advance with the archives.

Where archivists did not actually acquire the business records they had solicited, some were successful in persuading firms to establish a rudimentary company archives. Few had any influence on the development of a records management system, however.

For universities housing records of ongoing firms, the arrangements for transfer of records from the company to the repository vary. In most instances the archives receives records when they are designated as noncurrent, either because some basic records management schedule has been established or because of some change in the company organization, such as merger, relocation, or the discontinuation of a product line.

Other reasons cited for transfer of records include retirement of a chief executive or the fact that available storage space within the company is exhausted. In more than 50 percent of the cases where records of an ongoing firm have been deposited with a university, all significant records prior to a given date have been transferred. In some instances companies lent certain records, such as incorporation documents, board of directors' minutes, or employee personnel records to the university to microfilm, after which the original documents were returned to the company.

**Processing the Collection**

Besides problems of acquisition, difficulties of processing are also enormous. Processing large collections is time-consuming and expensive; yet almost none of the companies whose records were being deposited with a university helped provide funds for processing and arranging the collection.

Part of this, of course, can be accounted for by the fact that some of the records were of companies no longer in business and without assets to fund the processing of their records. Of those universities that did receive assistance, the amount was usually small, and probably in no case did it cover the actual cost of processing the entire collection.

While some institutions mentioned that they planned to seek such assistance, the experience of those who have tried is not encouraging. If companies are unwilling to establish their own archives, they are also apparently unwilling to pay another institution to do the job for them.

**Making the Collection Available for Use**

It appears, however, that once problems of acquisition and processing have been resolved, procedures for making the records available for research have been fairly routine. Nearly all the records on deposit in universities have few or no restrictions on access, and few require company approval to publish research based on business collections.

This is true apparently because most of the records are of firms no longer in business and many are of late nineteenth century businesses with few who were associated with the firm still living. Those universities indicating that some restrictions are imposed usually permit access to records at least twenty-five years old. The problems, then, focus on acquisition, processing, and
storage, not physical access by researchers.

Summary

It appears from this survey, then, that a majority of large universities with significant archival and manuscript holdings do collect business records, broadly defined. Particularly, they collect records of relatively small, privately held firms, frequently centered on the personal papers of an individual important in the company, such as its founder or president.

Most of the business collections are of defunct companies that conducted business in the same city or geographic area as the university that accepted their records. Most archives or special collections began collecting business records, not after first developing a collecting policy, but rather after they had accepted a business collection, some time after 1950. Few of these collections have restrictions on research access, and, taken together, business records comprise less than 10 percent of the holdings of university repositories.

Nearly all such collections are processed and have finding aids. Further, most business records are for the period prior to 1920. Few firms have helped provide even minimal funding to process their collections. Most negotiations for the acquisition of these records have been conducted by the archives or manuscripts staff. Of the collections acquired, almost none of the companies donating the records had either archival or records management programs, nor were many established as a result of dealing with archivists.

Those universities without business collections generally were not charged with the responsibility for developing collections other than university records; nor had they ever seriously considered collecting business records.

Strategy for Acquiring Business Archives

If this general summary represents the status of business records in college and university repositories, what are the prospects for development of business holdings? What special problems and likely solutions does this information suggest?

The most obvious problem is that modern business records are voluminous. Particularly for this reason, some rational collecting policy and acquisitions strategy are necessary. Recent attention has focused on large political collections of persons whose careers spanned a number of years and who held significant state or national elective offices.

At the presidential level, presidential libraries, built with private funds but maintained and staffed by the National Archives, have emerged as a solution for the problems of size and staffing. Proposed federal legislation may sharply increase the number of papers of public officials being transferred to archival repositories.*

No such solution is being discussed for the records of business. Although Oliver Wendell Holmes and Richard Berner have argued for increased governmental initiative in this area, their proposals, provocative and imaginative as they are, will not soon be realized.

In the immediate future, therefore, archivists must find some way to deal systematically with business records. Not to do so is to risk losing records fundamental to an understanding of our economic development. To many historians the business culture of American society characterizes the United States as much as its political democracy. The records of business are too significant to dismiss in the present because of inadequate space to house them or insufficient use to justify their retention.

These problems make it imperative that business records be selected with extreme care. A well-planned acquisitions strategy, undertaken singly by a university in a relatively small urban area or cooperatively by several institutions in a larger urban or geographic area, should begin with a survey of available records. Knowing what records

*The report of the National Study Commission on the Records and Documents of Federal Officials recommended that the papers of the presidents and vice-presidents be administered by the National Archives. Members of Congress as well as federal judges, however, would be permitted to deposit their papers in a repository that met statutorily defined minimum standards. The commission further recommended that Congress consider a one-time allocation of funds to nonfederal repositories that received public papers (SAA Newsletter May 1977, p.1, 3).
exist is essential to developing a policy for coordinated acquisition.

The first step in surveying is to define a geographic area large enough to be an identifiable region but small enough realistically to survey, such as a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area devised by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, a greater metropolitan area of a city, or a cluster of counties.

The next step is to develop an economic profile of the area from a historical perspective, using available published information. This material might be found in histories of the city or geographic area. More often, however, it will require some work in recent census data, visits to local chambers of commerce or manufacturers' and employers' associations, or trips to local libraries and historical societies to obtain adequate data for identifying the major economic characteristics of the area.*

The archivist should then work with faculty whose research interests are in business, business or economic history, or economics, to decide which types of businesses best typify the area and which have been most significant in the development of the community. This group of firms will form the survey population.

Before beginning the survey, however, it is important to enlist the support of the business community. This might be done by first seeking the cooperation of the local business associations or forming a select advisory committee of business leaders favorable to the project who are willing to be publicly identified with it. This is a time-consuming step, but it is an essential one if the subsequent survey is to be successful.

The survey of businesses can be conducted in a variety of ways, but a mail questionnaire is probably the easiest. Businesses, as previous general surveys by the Business Archives Committee have shown, are no more inclined than other institutions to provide detailed answers to questionnaires. It is therefore important for the questionnaire to include a cover letter, preferably individually typed, indicating the intent of the survey, the support of key business individuals or organizations for the project, and the general theme that business' story cannot be accurately told without preservation of, and access to, historically significant business records.

The letter should be addressed to the chief executive or chief operating officer of the company, asking that he or she forward the questionnaire to someone in the firm familiar with its noncurrent records, such as the corporate secretary, vice-president for administration, or controller. Avoid, if possible, public relations officers, who will probably not be in a position to provide complete information. The questionnaire itself should be carefully drawn to elicit the maximum amount of relevant information with the least amount of effort from the respondents. Determine what records are of greatest use to potential researchers and ask only for that information.

After developing a fairly detailed picture of the existence and availability of business records from completed questionnaires, the archivist should discuss a possible acquisitions strategy with faculty, local historical societies, and libraries. Ideally that decision should be made with the advice and assistance of the state historical society and the state historical records board. Acquisitions need not occur immediately, nor do selected firms all need to be approached at the same time.

The data from the survey, plus the analysis of faculty and historical and library agencies, will provide the general framework for a practical policy—one that is not likely to change radically over several years.

The framework gives the archivist the information needed to decide which companies should be cultivated and how likely their records are to be otherwise destroyed. It establishes a contact that can be maintained and a channel for receiving regular mailings of company literature and reports. It means that as the opportunity presents itself—company merger, retirement of a chief executive, the move of a company to a new location—the archivist is in a position to act.

It means that as funds become available,
from whatever source, the archivist has the ability to move relatively quickly to acquire collections or to process those already acquired.

Above all, it means that archivists take the initiative in developing a rational policy for documenting one of the most important and protean activities of American society—business.
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**COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TO WHICH QUESTIONNAIRES WERE SENT**

- Arizona State University
- Ball State University
- Barnard College
- Berea College
- Bowling Green State University
- Brigham Young University
- California Polytechnic State University
- Case Western Reserve University
- Colby College
- College of William and Mary
- Columbia University
- Cornell University
- DePauw University
- Eastern Michigan University
- Georgetown University
- Harvard University
- Howard University
- Iowa State University
- Marquette University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Memphis State University
- Michigan State University
- Northeastern University
- Northern Illinois University
- Northwestern University
- Oberlin College
- Queen's University at Kingston
- Rutgers University
- Sangamon State University
- Southern Illinois University
APPENDIX B
DEFINITION OF TERMS

The definition for business records/papers used in this article and in the original questionnaire is that found in Edwin A. Thompson, “A Glossary of American Historical and Literary Manuscript Terms” (Washington, D.C., 1965), p.21–22: “Records normally growing out of a commercial or industrial enterprise, and may include (among others) such items as accounts, account books, accounts current, accounts rendered, accounts stated, annual reports, annual statements, articles of association/incorporation, audits, balance sheets, bank letters, bank notes, bank statements, bankbooks, bills, bills of exchange, bills of lading, bills of sale, billbooks, blotters, bonds, business cards, canceled checks, cash accounts, cashbooks, cash-disbursement journals, certificates of incorporation, checks, checkbooks, corporation records, daybooks, deeds, deed polls, disbursement books, drafts, drawing accounts, estate papers/records, estimates evaluations, expense accounts, expense books, freight bills, household account books/records, indentures, invoices, invoice books, journals, justifications, land script, land warrants, leases, ledgers, letters of credit, licenses, manifests, market letters, memorandum books, mortgage notes, organization charts, partnership records, patents, payrolls, payroll records, personal accounts, prices current, private ledgers, profit and loss statements, promissory notes, purchase journals, purchase ledgers, purchase orders, purchase records, receipts, receipt books, records, regulations, rent rolls, reports, requisitions, sales journals, sales ledgers, sales notes, sales records, schedules, script, specifications, statements, stocks, stock certificates, stock ledgers, stores ledgers, tables, tallies, tally sheets/cards, tax certificates, time books, time sheets, trial balances, vouchers, voucher checks, warehouse receipts, waste books, and waybills.”
Femininity and the Librarian—Another Test

This study examined the sex-role orientation of library science students at a large university in the western United States. Each student enrolled in the M.L.S. program filled out the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. This gave each student a masculinity, a femininity, and an androgyny score. These scores were compared with a normative group provided by the author of the inventory. No significant differences were found between the two groups. It was concluded that the library science students were no different in their sex-role orientation from the normative population. This finding is opposite to those found by other studies dated both by instruments used and current societal trends.

Those who write on the subject of the librarian's image agree that there need to be improvements made in that image. The librarian is seen as a "kindly maiden lady in Red Cross shoes behind the circulation desk."¹ In fact, librarianship as a whole is viewed as a female profession that is weak, conservative, nonintellectual, and, most probably, boring.

In the midst of this situation is the male who happens to be a librarian. Since the turn of the twentieth century this creature, at best, has been considered "subnormal" as far as "normal" men go. This image of the male has some scientific basis; by use of personality tests it has been "proved" that males in librarianship are more feminine than the "normal" male.

Earlier Tests

Alice I. Bryan's study of male and female librarians showed that all exhibited traits of orderliness, responsibility, conscientiousness, conservatism, and conformism. They also lacked vigor, imagination, and ambition. They were shown to be introspective rather than outgoing, insecure, and more strongly interested in cultural and intellectual rather than in political and economic ideas; and they rated high in femininity.² Thus, thanks to scientific methods, the librarian's image and sex-role identity—whether true or not—were set.

In the 1960s two other researchers studied the personality of the librarian. Stuart Baillie, who studied the relationship between the library school and job success, gave his subjects the California Psychological Index (CPI) to fill out. The CPI is a paper-and-pencil test yielding eighteen personality scores, one of which is a measure of femininity. With this instrument Baillie found, among other things, that librarians were significantly (at the .001 level) more feminine than the normative sample provided by the authors of the CPI manual.³

Another person who investigated this idea was Howard Clayton. He was trying to determine whether there were distinctive personality characteristics that could be identified, through statistical measurement, among male students of library science who were enrolled at a major midwestern university during the summer of 1967. He developed a composite profile that was derived by computing the mean of fourteen adult occupational groups (the normative group) listed in the CPI manual. He compared his subjects with this composite profile and found that his subjects were
lower on sixteen of the eighteen personality scales. On one, self-acceptance, the two groups were equal, and on one, the femininity scale, his subjects were significantly higher than the norm, which indicated that they were more feminine than the "normal" male.\(^4\)

It now should be asked: Are the results presented really relevant to the masculinity-femininity roles as they are reflected in our society today? According to Newmyer the answer would have to be a resounding no. As pointed out in her article, the problem is not so much whether male librarians are more feminine than the norm, but rather whether the tests that so indicate are really valid, and whether the tests are measuring what is supposed to be measured. The answer is no.\(^5\)

If the history of the masculinity-femininity scales that have been used on librarians to determine that they are feminine in sex-role orientation is traced, some interesting insights will be found. In the two major personality inventories (the MMPI—Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory—and the CPI), though the terminology differs slightly, the questions used are measuring the same personality traits—such as aggressiveness versus nurturance and ambition versus abasement—as indexes of masculinity and femininity.

Since the M-F scales are similar in these instruments, the femininity scale of the CPI will be examined to demonstrate the type of questions asked and their "correct" responses for females. Males, in order to be considered masculine, should answer in the opposite manner.

I want to be an important person in the community. (False)
I'm not the type to be a political leader. (True)
I like mechanics magazines. (False)
I think I would like the work of a librarian. (True)
I'm pretty sure I know how we can settle the international problems we face today. (False)
I must admit I feel sort of scared when I move to a strange place. (True)
I like to go to parties and other affairs where there is lots of loud fun. (False)
If I were a reporter, I would like very much to report news of the theater. (True)
I would like to be a nurse. (True)
It is hard for me to "bawl out" someone who is not doing his job properly. (True)
I very much like hunting. (False)
I would like to be a soldier. (False)
I think I could do better than most of the present politicians if I were in office. (False)
I like to be with a crowd who play jokes on one another. (False)
In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up. (False)
I think I would like the work of a building contractor. (False)
When I work at something, I like to read and study about it. (False)
I am somewhat afraid of the dark. (True)
I like to boast about my achievements every now and then. (False)
I think I would like to drive a racing car. (False)
I must admit that I enjoy playing practical jokes on people. (False)
At times I feel like picking a fistfight with someone. (False)
The thought of being in an automobile accident is very frightening to me. (True)
I think I would like the work of a garage mechanic. (False)
A windstorm terrifies me. (True)
I think I would like the work of a dress designer. (True)
I think I would like the work of a clerk in a large department store. (True)\(^6\)

Notice that the fourth item (liking the work of a librarian) is keyed true only for females. If males answer the question "true," by definition they are feminine. This choice has been labeled feminine because at the time of the question construction the fact that more women than men were librarians was a statistical reality. However, this does not reflect the true psychological nature of the profession or sex role as it is defined today.

The author of the test summarizes the model personalities of the two sexes who score high on the femininity scale (i.e., they answer the questions the way females "should") in the following manner: For males, the terms he uses to describe them are appreciative, complaining, feminine, formal, meek, nervous, self-denying, sensitive, weak, worrying. Females answering in the exact same way are described as conscientious, discreet, generous, having a gentle helping nature, self-controlled, sympathetic, tactful, warm.

Those individuals who scored low on
femininity (i.e., answered the way males "should") are described as follows: For males, the description runs adventurous, aggressive, clear thinking, daring, impulsive, masculine, outgoing, pleasure-seeking, show-off, strong.

For females the description is coarse, dissatisfied, lazy, masculine, pleasure-seeking, restless, robust, self-centered, touchy, tough.7

It is fairly easy to see on this scale, which is one continuum—males on one end and females at the other—that if two people answer identically, one male the other female, one of them is described in positive terms and as being socially acceptable, while the other is described in negative terms and as being socially unacceptable. The same sort of slant occurs in the other personality scales of the CPI.

Thus, if this image of the male librarian is to be actually tested, a sex-role inventory without the problems of the traditional scales, such as the CPI, would be needed to test the hypothesis that male librarians are significantly more feminine than the "normal" male.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory

As can be seen from the above information, many tests that are being used to measure masculinity-femininity are not measuring the traits as they are represented in today's society. Realizing this fact, Sandra Bem, in 1973, developed a scale that corrected for the misconceptions of the other M-F scales that have tended to obscure two very important ideas. The first is that many individuals might be "androgynous"—that is, both masculine and feminine, both assertive and yielding, etc.—depending upon the situational appropriateness of these various forms of behavior. The second idea is that strongly sex-typed individuals might be seriously limited in the range of behavior available to them as they move from situation to situation.9

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) has a number of features that distinguish it from other M-F scales.

First, it includes separate masculinity and femininity scales, each of which contains twenty items (see table 1).

Second, because BSRI was founded on the idea that the sex-typed person was someone who had internalized society's sex-typed standards of desirable behavior for men and women, these personality characteristics were selected as masculine or feminine on the basis of sex-typed social desirability and not on the basis of differential endorsement by males and females as most other inventories have done. That is, a

| TABLE 1 | ITEMS ON THE MASCULINITY, FEMININITY, AND SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALES OF THE BSRI |
| Masculine Items | Feminine Items | Neutral Items |
| Acts as a leader | Affectionate | Adaptable |
| Aggressive | Cheerful | Conceited |
| Ambitious | Childlike | Conscientious |
| Analytical | Compassionate | Conventional |
| Assertive | Does not use harsh language | Friendly |
| Athletic | Eager to soothe hurt feelings | Happy |
| Competitive | Feminine | Helpful |
| Defends own beliefs | Flatterable | Inefficient |
| Dominant | Gentle | Jealous |
| Forceful | Gullible | Likable |
| Has leadership abilities | Loves children | Moody |
| Independent | Loyal | Reliable |
| Individualistic | Sensitive to the needs of others | Secretive |
| Makes decisions easily | Shy | Sincere |
| Masculine | Soft-spoken | Solemn |
| Self-reliant | Sympathetic | Tactful |
| Self-sufficient | Tender | Theatrical |
| Strong personality | Understanding | Truthful |
| Willing to take a stand | Warm | Unpredictable |
| Willing to take risks | Yielding | Unsystematic |

Note: The number preceding each item reflects the position of each adjective as it actually appears on the inventory.
characteristic qualified as masculine if it was judged to be more desirable in American society for a man than for a woman, and it qualified as feminine if the reverse was true.

Third, the BSRI characterizes a person as masculine, feminine, or androgynous as a function of the difference between his or her endorsement of masculine and feminine personality characteristics.

There is also a third twenty-item scale on the BSRI, the social desirability scale, that is completely neutral in regard to sex. It was used in the development of the scale to ensure that the inventory would not simply be tapping a general tendency to endorse socially desirable traits. Now it provides a neutral context for the masculinity and femininity scales.

**THE PRESENT STUDY**

It was the purpose of this study to test the sex-role orientation of library science students to see if it was different from that of the "normal" population. Two hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no statistically significant (at the .05 level) difference in the sex-role orientation of the male library science students as compared with the normative sample on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory.

2. There is no statistically significant (at the .05 level) difference in the sex-role orientation of the female library science student as compared with the normative sample on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory.

**Method**

To test these two hypotheses the following procedure was used: Library science students enrolled in the spring 1977 term at a major university in the western United States were asked to fill out the sixty-item BSRI.

The inventory gave the students sixty personality characteristics and asked them to rate themselves on each characteristic on a seven-point scale ranging from 1, "Never or almost never true," to 7, "Always or almost always true."

On the basis of the responses each person received three major scores: a masculinity score, a femininity score, and an androgyny score. The androgyny score was defined as the femininity score minus the masculinity score as outlined in both the Bem and the Strahan papers. 

The masculinity and femininity scores indicate the extent to which a person endorses masculine and feminine personality characteristics as self-descriptive. Masculinity equals the mean self-rating for all endorsed masculine items, and femininity equals the mean self-rating for all endorsed feminine items. Both can range from 1 to 7.

The androgyny score reflects the relative amount of masculinity and femininity that the person includes in his or her self-description, and, as such, it best characterizes the nature of the person's total sex role. It should be noted that in this conception the masculine sex role represents not only the endorsement of the masculine attributes but also the simultaneous rejection of feminine attributes. Similarly, a feminine sex role represents not only the endorsement of the feminine sex role but also the rejection of the masculine sex role.

The closer the androgyny score is to zero the more the person is androgynous. The androgynous sex role represents the equal endorsement of both masculine and feminine attributes. Thus, the androgynous individual should be able to remain sensitive to the changing constraints of the situation and engage in whatever form of behavior seems most effective at the moment regardless of its stereotype as appropriate for one sex or the other. Thus, the individual can engage freely in both masculine and feminine forms of behavior as appropriate to the given situation.

After the scores for the library science group were computed, those scores were compared with the normative data supplied by Bem. A t-test was used to compare the two groups to determine if the group of library science students was significantly different from the normative sample that consisted of 917 college students from two different colleges in the spring of 1973. On the basis of this comparison the two hypotheses were examined to see if the library science students were statistically different in their sex-role orientations from the normative group.
Analysis of Data

All students in the M.L.S. program at a large university in the western United States who were enrolled and taking classes during the spring term of 1977 filled out the Bern Sex-Role Inventory. This group consisted of sixteen males and twenty-six females.

Three scores were obtained from this inventory. One was the score on the masculinity scale, which consisted of twenty questions. Another was the score obtained on the femininity scale, which also consisted of twenty questions. A third score was derived from the two just mentioned. This was called the androgyny score and was computed by subtracting the score obtained on the masculinity scale from the score obtained on the femininity scale.

A negative score indicates that the individual is identifying more with the masculine role, while the positive score means that the individual is identifying more with the female role. The nearer the score is to zero, the more androgynous is the individual; that is, he or she is equally adept at taking the male or female role in the appropriate circumstances. The scores for each male subject are presented in table 2. The scores for each female subject are presented in table 3. The scores on the masculinity and femininity scales can range from 1 to 7.

This library science group (LIS) was compared with the normative group supplied by the Bern for the BSRI. This normative group consisted of 561 males and 356 females who were tested in two universities in California. Tables 4 and 5 show the results of that comparison. Table 6 compares the LIS males with the LIS females.

As can be seen from table 4 there are no significant differences on the masculinity, femininity, and androgyny scores between the male library science students and the normative male group. It appears that these male library science students are no more feminine or masculine in their sex-role orientation than the males in the normative group. These findings contradict those cited previously that indicate male library science students were significantly more feminine than the average male.

As can be seen from table 5, the female library science students and the normative group did not significantly differ in their mean scores on the masculinity scale. On the femininity scale of the inventory the LIS females scored significantly (at the .05 level) higher than did the normative group. However, on the androgyny scale there were no significant differences.

### TABLE 2

**Scores of Library Science Males on the BSRI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Masculinity Score</th>
<th>Femininity Score</th>
<th>Androgyny Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

**Scores of Library Science Females on the BSRI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Masculinity Score</th>
<th>Femininity Score</th>
<th>Androgyny Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at the total results, it appears that the library science females answered in a more feminine way the items on the femininity scale. However, when it comes to the ability to function well in either sex role, as an androgynous individual should, they are no different in that ability from the normative group. It must be concluded, then, that the library science females are not significantly different in their sex-role orientation from the members of the normative group.

When the library science males and females were compared with each other, it was found that the males and females were significantly different (at the .01 level) on all three of the scales, as is shown in table 6.

CONCLUSIONS

What can be concluded from this study on library science students and their sex-role orientation in general? Nothing can, or should, be inferred for any larger population than the one studied. In order for this study to be generalizable to a larger population of library science students, a random sample of library science students would have had to be taken and sampled, and then conclusions could have been made about the larger population. However, this was not done.

The major importance of this study is that it casts some doubt on the other studies that have tried to deal with the concept of sex role of the librarian or library science stu-
dent, in that it questions the validity of the instruments used in these other studies in measuring sex role, especially the CPI, and it demonstrates that significantly different results are obtained using a newer instrument that has, to a great extent, been freed of the more limiting concepts used to form other sex-role inventories.

It could be asked if this finding is part of a societal trend toward a less strict definition of sex roles. I believe not. As shown by the Bem inventory, there are still definite sex roles for each sex. The students studied showed many differences between the male and female endorsement of sex roles. The question becomes: Are males and females in library science different from other males and females in the society in their sex-role orientation, as has been suggested by the previously mentioned studies? It appears that they are not.

It is suggested that many more studies should be done using this instrument and others that may be developed in the ongoing search for knowledge about the personality and characteristics of the library science student and the librarian.
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Letters

Indexes as Memory Assists

To the Editor:

Elaine C. Clever's article "Using Indexes As 'Memory Assists" (C&RL, Sept. 1979) contains at least two major substantive errors.

First, on page 448 Clever attempts to compare the cost of searching Social Sciences Citation Index, Social Sciences Index, and Humanities Index. She states, "Assuming a rate of $9/hour, the cost of searching SSCI was 20.5 cents per minute for list I and almost 44 cents per minute for list II." Unfortunately, Clever confuses cost per minute with cost per hit (that is, the number of citations located). Cost per minute cannot vary unless the cost per hour varies. That is, assuming a set rate per hour (for example, Clever's $9/hour or 15 cents per minute), a seventy-five-minute search must cost the same per minute as a fifteen-minute search; only the total or end costs differ. While space precludes a complete analysis of Clever's error, it is clear that she has confused cost per minute with cost per hit.

Second, Clever utilizes a research design that biases the results. Clever insists on judging the utility of the Social Sciences Index and Humanities Index on the basis of criteria the two indexes were never designed or intended to fulfill. The two indexes were doomed to fail, as Clever's evaluation was based on functions which neither the publisher nor most subscribers expect the indexes to satisfy.

Finally, Clever cites a catalog use study by Lipetz and Stangl (Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science 5:137-39) as evidence that faculty and graduate students use periodical indexes as "memory assists." However, Lipetz and Stangl discuss use patterns of card catalogs only; no mention is made of indexes, abstracts, or other reference tools. One simply cannot assume, a priori, that use patterns of periodical indexes and abstracts parallel use patterns of card catalogs.

Evaluation research should focus on the function for which a product is designed. Evaluation of subject/author indexes on the basis of key word title criteria is both unnecessary and unacceptable.—David R. McDonald, Systems Librarian, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, California.

Response

To the Editor:

Mr. McDonald is right. It is cost per hit, which is what I had in the original manuscript, but I failed to catch the change in a subsequent revision.

More important, I regret that I did not elaborate on the relationship between the Lipetz and Stangl use study of the university catalog and research that shows that not only the catalog but other materials in the library are used extensively this way. It's implied, but not stated, that if a person comes into the library looking for something already known to exist and if that item is current, he or she will use indexes for the search. It may be obvious to the reference librarian that the search does not have a high likelihood of success, but it is interesting, I believe, to learn just how unlikely it is.—Elaine C. Clever.

ISBD: Aid or Barrier?

To the Editor:

Researchers often fail to extract all of the important information immanent in their data. In contrast, Gorman and Hotsinpiller (C&RL, Nov. 1979) have contrived to extract from their data more information than is actually contained in it. From being unable to reject their hypothesis that "there is no significant difference in understanding as between ISBD and non-ISBD (catalog) descriptions," Gorman and Hotsinpiller make an illogical leap. They conclude that their...
Study "proves that the ISBD aids, rather than hails, the understanding and speed of use of descriptive data." Astounding! The results merely suggest that ISBD descriptions are neither easier nor harder to understand than non-ISBD descriptions. One should perhaps more readily conclude that ISBD has provided a standard where none was needed.

The emphasis given to the speed of the use of ISBD descriptions is as unwarranted as the claim that they aid understanding. Given the timing methodology adopted, the observed average difference of only one second between ISBD and non-ISBD descriptions could be ascribed to experimental error. Speed is a virtue only if the responses are correct. Although the ISBD descriptions resulted in "15 quicker responses" (p.526), it is apparent that in four of these cases (questions 2, 4a, 7, and 15) the non-ISBD descriptions elicited more correct answers.

This study is flawed by at least seven serious reporting errors. Mostly these errors take the form of discrepancies between the text and the data; the data (appendixes 3 and 4) are assumed to be substantially correct. But appendix 3 contains two egregious summation errors: the total number of "correct" responses for non-ISBD descriptions should be 60, for a proportion of 65.2%; the number of "partially correct" responses for these descriptions should be 16, for a proportion of 17.4%.

Perhaps the most disquieting aspect of this work by Gorman and Hotsinpiller is their use of a catch-all rating category, Partially Correct, in which responses which "gave too much information (including the correct answer)" were given equal weight with responses which gave only "half of the answer." One is left to wonder how these quite different kinds of responses were distributed between ISBD and non-ISBD descriptions.

Taken together, the foregoing criticisms bring into question the reliability if not the validity of Gorman and Hotsinpiller's work. There is no compelling reason to suppose that the laxity which permeates their reporting did not extend also to the conduct of their enquiry.—Joseph M. A. Cavanagh, Library Systems Planner, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Maryland.

Response

To the Editor:

Joseph Cavanagh's letter about "ISBD: Aid or Barrier to Understanding" (C&RL, Nov. 1979) contains a number of assertions and implications upon which I would like to comment.

First, the "leap" from the hypothesis that ISBD and non-ISBD are equal in promoting understanding to the conclusion that ISBD aids, rather than hails, that understanding is not "illogical." The study suggests that ISBD entries may be marginally easier to understand than non-ISBD entries.

Second, Cavanagh relates speed and accuracy. The study did not. Cavanagh is free to interpret the data any way he chooses. We simply reported on the speed of response. I agree that the difference is certainly insignificant. In fact, after consulting with Charles Davis (dean of Illinois's library school) and other research-oriented colleagues at the University of Illinois, I can state that there is no statistically significant difference between ISBD and non-ISBD entries for any of the comparisons. This can be seen by inspection in most of the cases, but where it is not obvious, chi square and t test analyses do show that the observed differences could have occurred by chance. This suggests to me that users would be better served, or at least just as well served, by entries conforming to ISBD.

Third, of "seven serious reporting errors" Cavanagh quotes two. Both concern totals which are wrong by one (due to error in the translation from manuscript to typescript to print, not error in "summation"). Cavanagh describes these errors as "egregious"; I would suggest that he try to acquire a greater sensitivity to the English language or a greater sense of proportion. The other five (presumably less egregious) "errors" are not described. If they exist, one can assume that they have a similarly minor effect on the results of the study.

Fourth, in the real world "partially correct" is a large category of response. The study did not choose to analyze it further. I can see no benefit to be gained by doing so.

Fifth, Cavanagh's letter (and, in particular, its last sentence) should win some award for its snide sub-academic tone. Cavanagh is presumably trying to imply that
the whole study was rigged but has not the courage to say so.—Michael Gorman.

To the Editor:

Despite the elaborate “method,” the nicely reproduced card examples, and the impressive statistical tables, Michael Gorman and Jami Hotsinpiller’s “study” (C&RL, Nov. 1979) does not prove that “ISBD aids, rather than halts, the understanding and speed of use of descriptive data as compared with pre-ISBD descriptions.” Why? Not because of too small a sample nor the exclusive testing of undergraduates, but rather because the questions employed—e.g., “Is this book illustrated?” or “What is the subtitle?”—inevitably prejudice the results. That is, the questions themselves tend to induce “correct” answers. For instance, it’s a very different matter to ask an “ordinary user” what “ill.” means (in context) than to ask “Is this book illustrated?” The former question genuinely tests understanding and recognition, while the latter “gives away” the answer, merely testing (if anything) the respondent’s ability to apply external cues, to guess rightly with the benefit of Very Heavy Hints.

For examples of truly objective research into ordinary users’ understanding of standard bibliographic elements, particularly abbreviations, see Larry Legus’ “Sure, They Save Space, But Who Knows What They Mean?” HCL Cataloging Bulletin, no.40 (May–June 1979), p.24–29, and “The Mystery of Ips and Mono; or, Do Students Understand AV Card Catalog Terms?” by Jane Schlueter and Robert D. Little, in Deirdre Boyle’s Expanding Media (Phoenix: Oryx Pr., 1977). These studies, incidentally, demonstrated a significant non-recognition or non-understanding of such taken-for-granted cataloging conventions as “c” (copyright), “d” (died), “v” (volume), “l” (leaves), and “n.d.” (no date).

No, the “long-drawn-out ‘controversy’ over the ISBD” is hardly ended by Gorman and Hotsinpiller’s transparently flawed “research.”—Sanford Berman, Head Cataloger, Hennepin County Library, Edina, Minnesota.

To the Editor:

As a librarian who has been concerned with the fear public library users seem to have for our catalogs, I welcome Gorman and Hotsinpiller’s interest (C&RL, Nov. 1979). It appears, however, that wrong questions were asked about wrong books to (admittedly) wrong people.

Questions: Out-of-school public library users rarely seek information from the catalog about publisher, place of publication, or subtitle. Of the questions asked, only those relating to the author or title of the book might be asked with some frequency. There is a slight possibility that questions about illustrations might be asked.

Books: American public libraries deal overwhelmingly with English-language books. Why ask questions about books in foreign languages?

People: College students are a vastly different population from general public library users.

If catalog intelligibility is really our goal, why don’t we have our computers spell out what the ISBD symbols stand for? Our slogan might be: “ISBD for machines, English for people.” And less is more; we should simplify and suppress information that is not sought by the overwhelming majority of public library readers (e.g., place of publication, ISBN).

For an example of a reader-oriented format, see my “Scilken’s Supercard” (The Unabashed Librarian, no.12, 1974).

Why use arcane symbols when real English is available to us? If we make finding aids easier to use, perhaps more people will use our catalogs—and our libraries.—Martin H. Scilken, Director, Orange Public Library, Orange, New Jersey.

Academic Libraries and Undergraduate Education

To the Editor:

In the article “Academic Libraries and Undergraduate Education” (C&RL, Jan. 1980) it is stated that the CLR-supported college library programs were “based on concepts generated by Patricia Knapp’s Monteith College library experiment.” Patricia Knapp was one of the founders of the library-college movement and remained a key spokesperson for its precepts. We spent much of one day discussing library-college not long before her death on her last visit to Washington, D.C.
While it is encouraging to observe the studies made in bibliographic instruction practice in the 1970s, it is appropriate in this context, I believe, to acknowledge its antecedents in library-college theory and practice.

Promulgated by the writings and practice of Louis Shores and B. Lamar Johnson in the 1930s and revitalized by Louis Shores, Patricia Knapp, and others in the 1960s, the concepts of library-college are virtually identical with those expressed in the Gwinn article: "the closer integration of academic libraries with undergraduate education," "an academic library . . . as an active, committed partner in . . . education," and "to provide to the academic library world examples of things that could be done to integrate the library more fully into campus life."

The majority of the librarians mentioned in this article and its bibliography of CLR-supported college library programs were participants in one or more of the many library-college workshops held yearly or more often since 1965.

Long articles on library-college can be found in the Encyclopedia of Education and the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science.—Robert T. Jordan, Professor, Department of Media, Information and Learning Systems, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Research and Publication Requirements

To the Editor:

The elaborate research design of Rayman and Goudy in their article "Research and Publication Requirements in University Libraries" (CeRL, Jan. 1980) is wasted on a set of incomplete returns. The authors sent questionnaires to all ninety-four ARL libraries but received only sixty-eight responses. A 72 percent return on some questionnaires is considered a success, but in this case the institution that does not respond either has something to hide or cares too little about the subject to bother responding. In either case we need to know which libraries responded.

Can we assume that the sixty-eight libraries that responded to the questionnaire represent a true cross section of the ARL libraries or not? Our researchers tell us nothing about those who responded or those who did not respond. Though they express their hope that this study will provide a benchmark for future investigations, without the knowledge of which libraries (or even which types of libraries) responded we cannot know whether the next study on this subject will deal with the same set of libraries. The results may not be comparable.

Why couldn't the names of these institutions be published? The authors are not dealing with secret information; rather it is policy information that presumably could be obtained from published personnel documents or from any librarian on each campus. It is time we started gathering complete data and naming names in the same way that AAUP gathers salary data. Then we can have a data base on which to do some research.—R. Dean Galloway, Library Director, California State College, Stanislaus.

Response

We would like to thank R. Dean Galloway for his letter. We reluctantly reply since we mutually feel that the "letter-to-the-editor" format, with which Galloway is so well versed, is an inadequate forum in which to analyze or criticize research effectively in our field. Statements of opinion, no matter how well intentioned they may be, are absolutely no substitute for actual research.

We carefully delineated the limitations inherent in our research and dealt with those effectively. And, because of the sensitive nature of our ground-breaking study, we assured potential respondents of complete confidentiality. We were rewarded with a very acceptable return rate, as well as a number of revealing comments that helped in the writing of our article. We feel confident that the results of our research are valid and valuable and will provide a basis for continued research on this increasingly important topic.—Ronald Rayman and Frank Wm. Goudy.
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BOOK REVIEWS


Two works, quite different in scope and intent, add to the ever-growing literature on library service to disabled persons. While it would be difficult to compare them, since one is a compilation of papers and the other is an information handbook, both serve a useful purpose.

Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped: An International Approach contains the key papers presented by the Working Group of Librarians for the Blind at the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) Congress held in Czechoslovakia in 1978. The group had been organized after the 1977 IFLA Congress when librarians working with the blind and physically handicapped had been invited to meet with the Hospital Libraries Section of IFLA. Frank Kurt Cylke, director of the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped at the Library of Congress, not only took the lead in urging the formulation of such a group but also proposed five areas of study requiring immediate attention: copyright, bibliographic control, postal regulations and customs laws, formats, and international liaisons. These are the topics covered in the key papers.

An excellent state-of-the-art paper on the various formats in nonprint media serves as an introduction to the small volume. Following that are chapters on copyright and postal and custom laws, which bring up-to-date regulations in these areas and point out the problems encountered by those serving print handicapped readers who must deal with national laws in addition to international conventions and accords. The fourth paper describes international organizations, such as the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind, with whom the group should cooperate.

The final paper is a plea for standardization in cataloging special format materials for the blind and handicapped—not only to facilitate access to materials at the international level but also to save costs in cataloging when such materials are acquired.

These well-written papers would be particularly helpful for those who must concern themselves with problems in such areas as copyright, interlibrary loan, and cataloging codes.

Serving Physically Disabled People: An Information Handbook for All Libraries is the first comprehensive book on the subject from the library point of view. Its author, Ruth Velleman, who is head librarian for the library media center at the Human Resources School on Long Island, is especially qualified to write this book. In addition to her work at the Human Resources Center, which includes not only the school for some 200 orthopedically disabled young people, but also a work demonstration center for physically handicapped adults and a research center, Velleman has been teaching a course on library services for the disabled; much of the material in the book was gathered in preparation for her class.

The basic arrangement of the work is by type of library, i.e., one of the main sections is devoted to the public library; another to the special rehabilitation library; and the last to school and university libraries.

It should not be read as though each part were complete in itself, however. If one were to read only the part on school and university libraries, for example, one would miss almost all of the discussion on the very important Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and other laws relating to the civil rights of the disabled. Similarly, if one read only the part on the public library, an extremely useful section on rehabilitation research and services would be missed.

The field is so complex it is difficult to put it in separate categories—there is always some overlapping—but Velleman has managed to present an enormous amount of information, with references as late as Janu-
ary 1979, with a minimum of redundancy.

Two of the fourteen chapters are presented by others: "The Librarian and the Blind Patron," by Hanan C. Selvin, a blind sociology professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and "Special Needs of the Deaf Patron," by Alice Hagemeyer, a deaf librarian at the Washington, D.C., Public Library. Both discuss library services from the point of view of their own disabilities and include many resources and services that should be of interest to those serving blind and/or deaf patrons.

Velleman discusses attitudes toward handicapped individuals, types of physical disabilities, legislation, information for independent living, barrier-free design, rehabilitation, special education, and the role of the library in serving special groups.

Each chapter contains many references to materials and services in addition to the footnote citations found at the end of each chapter. There are also three chapters devoted entirely to resources: "A Core Public Library Collection," "A Model Rehabilitation Library," and "A Core Special Education Collection." Each is further divided into subject areas such as legislation and financing, sex and the disabled, travel, and death; and extensive, annotated bibliographies are provided for each.

Appendices include lists of various agencies, training centers, resource centers, and sources of equipment with addresses and phone numbers. There is also a detailed index which adds considerably to the usefulness of the book.

While a great deal of valuable and sometimes difficult-to-find information has been brought together in a well-written and concise manner, perhaps the most valuable part of the book is that on attitudes and understanding. If librarians had read this earlier, perhaps there would have been no need for the emphasis placed on services to the disabled at the recent White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

Both of these works are important—indeed Velleman's must be considered a landmark—but they will be useful for different reasons. Certainly all librarians who are serving or should be serving disabled people should have the Velleman book. Those who are interested in the international aspect of problems relating to materials for the handicapped should also have the IFLA volume.—Lucille Whalen, State University of New York at Albany.


The periodical crisis for libraries, now recognized to be of major proportions, is defined in a series of five important documents and additional secondary literature. Vernon Palmour's Study of the Characteristics, Costs and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1972) is the first, pointing to the major costs and administrative problems for academic libraries. The Association of Research Libraries concluded from this study that the best way to reduce ILL costs is to improve periodical loans, and alternatives are suggested in Palmour's Access to Periodical Resources: A National Plan (Washington: ARL, 1974).

Further work by Palmour, Bernard Fry, Peter Watson, and others led to the conclusion that other periodical costs can be reduced through some form of cooperative arrangement. NCLIS appointed a task force on a national periodicals system to prepare a specific plan, and their suggestions are in Effective Access to the Periodical Literature: A National Plan (Washington, 1977), referred to as the Green Book. The core of the proposed national periodicals program is the creation of a national periodicals center (NPC), a facility to house a national collection used to provide nationwide interlibrary loans for periodicals at greatly reduced national costs.

In the fall of 1977, the Library of Con-
gress asked the Council on Library Resources to prepare a technical development plan for a national periodicals center and to write the plan in such a way that LC or some other designated agency could operate the center as the hub of an organization to provide several levels of periodical service to the nation. The project director, C. Lee Jones, worked with a number of consultants, advisors, and reviewers to write A National Periodicals Center: Technical Development Plan (Washington: CLR, 1978). This study is now referred to as the Burgundy Book.

The fifth in this series of major studies, but perhaps not the last, is a report to NCLIS by the Arthur D. Little group, a comparative evaluation of the suggested alternatives (The White Book). The thrust is to provide a technical-economic analysis of the three means for providing access to periodical literature. These three are: a system of nonintervention, or basically the system as it exists today—what some hold to be no system at all; the concept of a national periodicals center—a dedicated center, established as a national, single source; and a multiple tier arrangement—perhaps better described as a private sector network.

Each of these is presented using background information, details on the systems themselves, the specific issues involved with each, "criteria elements," financial costs, benefits analysis, and finally an analysis of the qualitative issues. The discussions are supported by twenty well-constructed and helpful tables.

Little question exists that access to current and retrospective serials, especially periodicals, is both critical to library service and difficult to provide with speed and other efficiencies. The concept of an NPC (the Burgundy Book) seemed to answer many questions, but many others arose after a chance for examination and evaluation. Some of these questions are studied and considered in the White Book.

The Burgundy Book seems to hold that the position it discusses is revealed truth and leaves no room for question and discussion. The White Book asks several questions and raises many doubts about the absolutes stated in the Burgundy Book. The primary question examined in the White Book is cost: Would the $26 million subsidy answer the need? Can these funds be more effec-
tively used in other ways, even if they are to be made available?

The chapter concerned with "financial costs and benefits analysis," almost half of the book, summarizes in outline format the catalyst for success or failure—money. The need for some form of service is clear, but that may not be a compelling argument when benefits are considered. The cost analysis is detailed, even if based on incomplete data. The theoretical quality of the projections clearly presents a number of unresolved and previously unstated problems with any large financial commitment.

The White Book takes the position that any enabling legislation for whatever system eventually develops will not be passed until at least 1985. This lead-time permits use of "scenario projections" that can be used by those interested in formulating opinions shaping future decisions on periodical systems.

The analysis in the White Book is perceptive in that a number of observations on the apparent development of an NPC that have been hinted in informal discussions or suggested in some recent literature are articulated clearly and argued forcefully. Some administrative problems of the NPC's promised configuration, such as presently-standing contracts, not discussed in the Burgundy Book, are brought out in the White Book.

Unlike the Green and Burgundy Books this White Book has a brief bibliography, only ten items, and some of these are not clearly identified. In addition, the White Book has no index. Neither do the Green and Burgundy Books. These omissions are unfortunate and lessen the effectiveness of the series.

The White Book's reasoning is tight, the outline technique presents options clearly and unambiguously, and the presentation is fair and reasonably full, covering as it does the pros and cons to the three options. This is not intended only to throw cold water on the idea of an NPC, but it does slow down what might be an overly enthusiastic rush toward a "solution," which needed fuller examination and evaluation.

Individuals on both sides of the NPC concept, and especially the mugwumps, should study the White Book. It is more than helpful. It is an essential part of the background information that librarians need to have to formulate a rational and successful solution to a pressing problem.

The 1970s were a decade for the recognition and definition of the periodicals crisis; perhaps the 1980s will be the decade for a solution.—Neal L. Edgar, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.


The appearance of a new directory to sources can be a welcome sight because, the user hopes, it updates significantly, broadens the scope meaningfully, and can be used easily. Where to Find Business Information meets all of these hopes successfully. Listed alphabetically are 5,108 English-language sources from all countries now being published, with concentration on periodic publications and services including computerized data bases; thus timeliness and broadening of field are achieved. There are more than 2,500 subjects to use as access points leading the user to an annotated listing of sources, and there is an index of publishers—the three assuring ease of use.

The 1979 timeliness makes it a useful adjunct to three 1976 publications: Lorna Daniells' Business Information Sources, Paul Wasserman's Encyclopedia of Business Information Sources, and Mary Grant and Norma Cote's Directory of Business and Financial Services. Daniells' book with its cursive discussions of methods of locating facts, basic time saving sources, and chapters on the various areas of interest to business is more truly a guide than Brownstone and Carruth's work. Wasserman's guide, with its dictionary arrangement and extended table of contents covering the 1,300 subject headings, each subdivided as to type of material, is a quicker and easier path to a printed source for a specific citation dealing with a single point. Grant and Cote's is a directory of 1,051 publications of business information agencies, a more limited range than the others. The more recent Bowker Business Books and Serials in Print 1977
and its 1977-78 Supplement cover the entire field of current business literature most completely of all.

With its emphasis on information services, major newsletters, trade journals, and government and special periodicals, Where to Find Business Information can be of particular assistance in answering questions relating to ongoing businesses, such as finding new markets, allied businesses or sources of supply, and advertising new products. It is a welcome additional tool too for handling the business information explosion resulting from new forms of computer and publishing technology.—Barbara R. Healy, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.


Finding information about Congress and federal legislation can be a long and rather involved procedure due to the complex nature of the legislative process and the maze of approaches and materials available. Goehlert has prepared an introductory guide that very briefly outlines the journey from bill to law and describes the tracing of legislation and the researching of information about legislators. Unfortunately, there are shortcomings.

For the uninitiated this book is little more than an annotated bibliography of available resources, with few if any hints on how to use these materials. Though the author touches base with a variety of government and commercially produced legislative reference aids, most of these are only very briefly described. For some publications, such as those from CIS and CQ, little help is needed; for others, such as the Calendars of the House and Senate, Digest of Public General Bills, United States Code, Congressional and Administrative News, and others, the novice needs much more assistance. Numerous page illustrations from reference works often add to the confusion, as they are not self-explanatory, nor is their role explained in this overpriced text. Illustrations, lists of research centers, and a fifty-two-page directory of government depository libraries account for half the
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book. Instead of listing 1,300 libraries, it would have been more helpful to devote two or three pages to a description of the Superintendent of Documents Classification System (SuDocs). Even a brief outline of SuDocs and the arrangement of the various relevant publications would have given the researcher a major advantage. Goehlert mentions SuDocs, but he does not outline the system or its role in libraries or the research process.

Furthermore, though Goehlert discusses the Serial Set, no one unfamiliar with it could possibly discern its relationship to materials and the tracing of legislation. In fact, the index to the Serial Set, the Numerical Lists and Schedule, is not even mentioned. A serious drawback is that citational interrelationships are not clearly explained, such as, for a report, its place in the Serial Set and how to locate it.

There is useful information in this book, but it is not pulled together in a way that most laypersons (and librarians) could easily understand. If one is already familiar with legislative research, the text is helpful; unfortunately, for the beginner it is confusing. If additional space were devoted to some of the problems enumerated and extraneous materials omitted, Congress and Lawmaking would be a more useful book. — Alan Edward Schorr, University of Alaska, Juneau.


This ambitious survey of publishing activities and information transfer processes in nineteen countries with representative or parliamentary forms of government, nine major international organizations, including the UN family, and three private publishers is both a historical account of the development of publishing and a current assessment of the “forms of organization, the policies, and the objectives associated with official information and publishing.” This is not a bibliographic work nor one that librarians would keep handy to assist in bibliographic searching or answering reference questions. Instead, it should be read to increase understanding of the field by all librarians dealing with foreign and international documentation. Students of the printing and publishing efforts of the United States and Canadian governments will also find it of value for the comparisons offered.

Even though the United States is probably the best-developed country in dissemination of publications, much can be learned from the trials and errors, successes and failures, and shortcomings and achievements of other governments.

For the practicing librarian, information is presented on historical quantity and quality of government publishing and its availability through bibliography as well as sources of supply. Occasionally, actual publications are listed in the text or as an appendix for purposes of illustration (e.g., Hong Kong Fact Sheets, page 169).

Organization charts showing the structure of each government’s information and publishing or printing apparatus and working definitions currently in use increase the value of the work for purposes of comparison and idea generation. Differing attitudes toward copyright versus public domain also offer a basis for further exploration of this complicated and controversial area of public policy. Important differences in theory of information dissemination other than through publication are explored and conclusions drawn regarding their relative success or lack of it.

The volume is organized into three parts, including the scope and importance of official publishing, the survey itself, and the general review and conclusions from the study. While the format is a reproduction of the authors’ original typescript for economy and timeliness, neither the type style nor the few typos encountered distract from the topic at hand.

The coverage from country to country is somewhat uneven, but necessarily so given the diverse nature of government publishing. Each country does include many of the following topics: population, constitution and form of government, information organization, publishing organization, range of government publishing, history of development, policy, parliamentary publishing, ref-
erences, and relevant appendixes. One appendix (page 400) does make an attempt to compare information and publishing activities in each country in chart form. The work does not include discussion of scientific and technical information dissemination.

Presenting the text thus in a broad and flexible format, Cherns has, for the most part, avoided making generalizations unsubstantiated in the text. Use of footnotes, however, is somewhat uneven. A reference to the United States, "public and congressional printing, because of its position on the fringe of the political area, was the subject of speculation, jobbery and scandal," appears undocumented, while the source of "an examination . . . [that] disclosed serious logistical and control deficiencies in the handling of orders" is duly noted.

Many of Cherns' conclusions found throughout the text and especially in part III should be further explored by librarians and government policy makers. "The right to know needs to be matched by the desire to inform" and "Useful information may be passive simply in the sense that nobody knows it is there or that there is a deliberate decision not to publish it" are among the many thoughtful observations that should give rise to additional study in each country surveyed.

This work is recommended for library schools and libraries dealing with foreign and international documentation and to students of public policy in the field of information generation and dissemination.—Joan G. Kerschner, Nevada State Library, Carson City.


While the amount of literature on American library history has been mushrooming in recent years, a monographic study devoted to the historical development of the largest Chinese-language collection in the West, that at the Library of Congress, did not appear until the completion of this dissertation.

The history of the Library of Congress' Chinese collection began in 1869 with some
950 books, the result of an exchange program between the United States and China. Since then the collection has grown steadily; as of 1977 it held a total of approximately 430,000 volumes.

S. C. Hu, who is on the faculty at St. Francis College of Pennsylvania, has carefully examined the social, cultural, and political forces of Sino-American relations that led to the building and development of the collection, as well as the acquisitions policies that have evolved and been implemented and the personnel and financial sources involved. Of special interest to bibliophiles and scholars is the detailed account of the collection's holdings of Chinese local histories, collectanea, and rare books. Based largely upon annual reports and official documents, supplemented with secondary sources and personal interviews, the work provides, in historical perspective, a comprehensive, well-documented, and interesting description of a vernacular-language collection at the Library of Congress.

The primarily expository, rather than comparative, approach that the author has taken leaves the work open to the criticism of a general lack of critical evaluation of its subject. As mentioned above, the collections of Chinese local histories, collectanea, and rare books are noted as being strong; but it would have been more useful to indicate how these holdings compare with those in other libraries. What, for example, are the Library of Congress' strengths and weaknesses in terms of the holdings of similar material at the Harvard-Yenching Library of Harvard University and the Gest Oriental Library of Princeton University?

Hu stresses that "the Chinese collection in the Library of Congress contained 1,622 rare items as of 1942" (page 108). By item he means "title," not "volume." Given that the Gest Oriental Library has 24,024 volumes of Ming (1368-1644) editions, not including the pre-Ming publications, what is the significance of this figure for the number of the Chinese rare books the Library of Congress owns?

Elsewhere, Hu writes: "Speaking of the Ming imprints, mention should be made of the great Yung-lo ta-tien, of which the Library has 41 volumes, constituting more than 10% of its extant volumes" (page 111).

Although the Yung-lo Encyclopedia indeed belongs to the Ming period, it seems inaccurate to refer to this handwritten manuscript as an imprint.

In general, this volume should probably be recommended as supplemental reading material for students of world library history and Chinese studies. It surpasses the amount of information formerly found only in scattered articles and is definitely superior in quality and quantity compared with the Japanese counterpart, "A History of the Japanese Collection in the Library of Congress, 1874-1941," which was published in 1970 (Senda Masso kyaju koki kinen toshokan shiryō ron shu [Tenri, Japan], pages 281-327).—William S. Wong, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.


Both experienced and novice film archivists, as well as film librarians, will welcome the International Federation of Film Archives' (FIAF) 1979 publication of their valuable manuscript on film cataloging. FIAF's Cataloging Commission views cataloging as a complex task involving the gathering and arranging of data and the creation of a system or systems around which the entire film archive revolves (page 3).

The guide's seven chapters and extensive appendixes offer a wide variety of methods that have been used successfully by film archives throughout the world to catalog their films. Topics covered span a broad range of subjects including film cataloging problems and their effects on the entire cataloging process, the strengths and weaknesses of cataloging systems and their application to archival operating conditions, the processes of actual cataloging, and determining which records are important enough to keep. Practical recommendations are given for each area.

The advisory, rather than prescriptive, method used by the guide enables readers to form their own opinions and adopt appropriate methods to their own institutions. In addition, procedures discussed are followed by examples from at least three FIAF libraries, suggesting the usefulness of each
method. Factors readers should consider before implementation of any particular approach are thoroughly explored. Concurrently, warnings to avoid excessive detail and to investigate all variables before adopting a procedure are emphasized.

While valuable for avoiding expensive, time-consuming errors and for generating new ideas, the book does have drawbacks. This is especially obvious in the chapter on cataloging systems, in which automation is referred to with innumerable warnings. Automation in film libraries has increased considerably since 1975. However, while logical, judicious reasons are given for the perpetuation of archaic manual systems, referrals to successful automated systems do not receive ample notice.

Another problem relates to the audience level for which the book is written. Although detailed examples and frequent referrals to original sources are made, a moderate to high degree of reader knowledge about film archives and cataloging is often assumed. One perplexing paragraph opens with the following sentence: "Most organizations wish to index subject contents, catalogs, and documents." Examples then given are "those operating stockshot services or those with substantial holdings of actuality film" (page 47). Closer attention to sentence clarity and inclusion of a glossary of terms would have minimized problems such as these and would have increased the guide's appeal to a wider audience.

A final problem relates to the guide's bibliography. While it is extensive, only one addition to the selected bibliography has been made since the manuscript was originally copyrighted in 1975. More up-to-date citations in such rapidly changing areas as automation would be welcome.

Although extremely important for film librarians, guidelines dealing with the unique problems of film cataloging standardization have been rare. As Michael Gorman points out (in Nancy Allen's Film Study Collections [Ungar, 1979], page 118), cataloging rules such as those in the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules attempt to provide a detailed set of guidelines for standardized cataloging for a wide range of materials. However, these rules have generally been inadequate for many aspects of film cataloging. The FIAF Cataloging Commission's guidelines are intended exclusively for the cataloging of film stock itself, thus filling an important gap in the cataloging literature.

This authoritative book by a reputable source should be highly welcomed by both film archivists and non-archival film librarians alike, all of whom will benefit from following and embellishing upon its suggestions.—Jill Provan, State University of New York, College at Buffalo.


Those familiar with the development of the preservation of materials as a distinct specialization within librarianship are aware that, in the not so distant past, a negative attitude surrounded sound recordings. In fact, recordings were often not taken very seriously by librarians, nor were they given the respect accorded to print sources. Most certainly this earlier, almost cavalier, regard for the recorded media has now changed. Presently a considerable body of material has developed related to the restoration and preservation of sound recordings.

McWilliams' work will be welcomed by librarians and archivists at all levels of the library world as the piece that successfully draws together many of the conclusions, admonitions, and advice set forth in much of the relatively recent, and at times obscure, sources of literature on the subject. Not only does the work have application all the way from the rural public library to the national archives, but it also covers the entire field of sound preservation and restoration in a manner not found in any other single volume.

The author has based his book on extensive research at major sound archives in the United States and has been a frequent contributor to professional recording journals and magazines. The book will be seen as a useful and practical handbook of immediate value to those contemplating setting up, maintaining, or improving their library sound recording preservation programs.
Technical considerations are always discussed in lay terminology. Those of us who have compassion for the preservation of our collections but have no compassion, or endurance, for reading works that continually bog one down in technical detail will actually have fun reading this book. Where there seems to be some point of difference among experts regarding various technical considerations, McWilliams attempts to bring out both points of view.

Several points could stand some clarification, however. McWilliams, in his discussion of disc cleaning, does not note that the use of detergents generally is not recommended for vinyls, as essential oils can be removed from the disc. Fotoflo or mild soaps are the preferred cleaning mode. However, detergents or freon is fine for acetates. The discussion of “tails-out” storage for tape is good and presents both pros and cons but neglects a thorough discussion of the preprint and postprint phenomenon. While McWilliams makes a strong point regarding the use of top-quality cassettes with hand-driven screws it should be noted that sonic sealed cassettes are not necessarily inferior. A bad product can occur with either screws or sonic welds.

Practical information is given regarding styluses, cartridges, tone arms, and turntables, but a stronger point, perhaps, could have been made regarding the criticalness of cartridge, tone arm, and tracking force matching. In some combinations the maximum force will often cause far less record wear than the minimum force. Additional discussion would have been useful in this important area of equipment maintenance.

The book is supplemented by excellent pictures, with the final section of the book detailing considerations that should be encompassed within a well-developed preservation policy. Shelving, environment, and dedicated equipment considerations are carefully brought forth. Finally, a directory of manufacturers and suppliers is given, along with an excellent annotated bibliography. This is a work that every library possessing a tape or record collection should have. Even at the latest closing gold prices, it’s worth its weight!—Edward D. Garten, Northern State College, Aberdeen, South Dakota.
assert itself as a valid area of attention in a
great library; illuminating, as a gathering of
vignettes about those individuals, famous or
unfamiliar, who impressed their per­
sonalities on the collection; and well told, in
the best tradition of British scholarship:
pleasingly narrated with thorough documen­
tation.

The main text (pages 23-160) is followed
by appendixes entitled “The Administration
of the Department of Printed Books,” “The
Nature of the Music Catalogues and the
Processes of Their Maintenance,” “The Size
and Growth of the Music Catalogues,”
“Statistics of Entries in the Music
Catalogues,” and “The Reckoning and
Growth of the Collections.” The book con­
cludes with lists of principal librarians,
keepers of printed books, keepers of manu­
scripts, and officers in charge of printed
music, a list of sources, and an index.

It seems that the early hero of the drama
was one Thomas Oliphant, who took care of
the music collection from 1841 to 1850.
Hired to make the initial catalog of music
materials, he invented a system and
plunged into it. Before he left he had done,
single-handed, some 34,000 titles and had
no backlog. Moreover, he was active in try­
ing to plan a future for the collection, to
promote particular acquisitions, and gener­
ally to put music in the mainstream of con­
cern. However, he antagonized the man
who must be marked as the prime villain of
the tale, none other than Sir Anthony
Panizzi himself.

Panizzi, who was keeper during
Oliphant’s term, did offer some support at
the beginning but had no real interest in
music. Eventually he fell out with Oliphant,
over matters of absence and tardiness, and
soon drove him away; after that, music was
in less inspired hands for thirty-five years,
and it did not catch the fancy of adminis­
trators who succeeded Panizzi. As late as
1904, Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, di­
rector and principal librarian, was heard to
say that “too many of the staff wasted their
time on music and such-like flummery.”

But favorable forces were at work, mostly
based in the London musical community.
They needed a vigorous catalyst, and they
found him in William Barclay Squire, who
took over responsibility for music in 1885.
Until 1920, Squire processed materials, campaigned to have some staff assigned to him, and urged the printing of a music catalog (which finally appeared in 1912). He gained the support of the administration and built the framework that his distinguished followers, W. C. Smith and King, would use in shaping the world's finest music library.

We may hope that Alec Hyatt King will complement the present volume with one that describes the work of Smith, as well as the major events and achievements of his own tenure.—Guy A. Marco, Library Development Consultants, Washington, D.C.


This book is a definite contribution to the literature on library buildings. It is a book for all library planners, for academic and public librarians, and for special librarians, as well as for architects, engineers, and designers. The authors state early in the book that it is primarily for the design and planning of small to medium-size public libraries serving from 200 to 2,000 people per day. However, the information in the book is prepared in such an enlightening manner that it is beneficial to those planning large urban central library buildings, academic library buildings, or even school and special library rooms.

The authors declare what they believe to be the performance objectives for the readers of their book, which are that the reader should be able to "prepare a library improvement program," "recognize library functional relationships," "critique an existing library building," "interview and select an architect and consultant," "evaluate the work of a library design team," "evaluate proposed library sites," "critique schematic designs for libraries," and "improve energy conservation, graphics, seating, and lighting in existing libraries as well as in library plans."

From there the authors proceed in a simple, straightforward, factual arrangement of their information. For example, lists are often used, such as, where to purchase materials, information on suppliers and manufacturers, and twenty-five energy conservation tips. Further, the whole work is liberally supplied with photographs and line drawings to express design features. The book ends with a selection of case studies of actual library space programs.

The book is clearly not an intellectual effort on the theory of library construction or space planning. On the other hand, it is a straightforward handbook on how to plan for library space utilization and how to design for functional use of space.

While generally the work consists of practical information, it is noted, however, that if not directly in the text, then generally through illustration and photographs, unusually high priced or expensive furniture is specified. On the other hand, general practitioners using this book should be able to discern this for themselves.

The book could have been more efficiently produced. Unusually wide margins are used (1¼-inch inner margin and 2½-inch outer margin). Also as an example of waste space, page 264 contains a simple two-line caption for a drawing on the facing page 265. Thus, through some economy of space in the layout of the book, the information could have been presented in about 25 percent less space than was used. On the other hand, the format that was employed does add to the attractiveness of the book and its simple use.

On the whole this book is valuable to all library planners and should be added to the collection of any practicing librarian or library collecting information on library buildings.—Hal B. Schell, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.


In this book, which covers censorship attempts in the United States over a ten-year period, the author, L. B. Woods, presents evidence showing that censorship is on the increase. Woods gives the following reasons for having done the study. The principal reason, he says, was that empirical knowl-
edge relating to censorship is sketchy and often is based on opinion, not fact. More data are needed by persons who have to be involved, especially in subject areas likely to come under attack in schools and libraries. A second reason for the study was due to the U.S. Supreme Court decision of June 21, 1973, that changed interpretations of the First Amendment relating to obscenity regulations. The third reason was based on the author's conviction that censorship is much more prevalent than many librarians and educators believe and that specific facts might help them if they should ever be faced with censorship issues.

A great deal of quantitative data about censorship in the United States are presented by Woods in an effort to answer nine specific questions. These questions, in brief form, are: (1) When did the censorship attempts occur? (2) Where did they occur? (3) How many items were censored? (4) What formats of materials were censored? (5) What types of educational institutions were affected by the censorship attempts? (6) What were the titles of the censored materials? (7) What were the sources of the censorship attempts? (8) What were the reasons for the censorship attempts? (9) What were the final dispositions of the censorship attempts?

Several interesting facts emerged in the study. One was that schools accounted for 62 percent of all educational censorship, with more than two-thirds of this on the high school level. The author noted that "public libraries were less censored than colleges and universities, but more censored than other school levels or junior colleges." The most often censored title was Catcher in the Rye, and the second most often censored was Soul on Ice. Many other interesting facts are given on the various topics, and tables are included to document the findings.

This is a well-written, carefully prepared study of censorship in America between the years 1966 and 1975. It should be of invaluable assistance to anyone who has to deal with censorship problems.—Martha Boaz, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.


The first book-length use study of government publications, Use of Government Publications by Social Scientists, examines the use and nonuse of federal, state, local, foreign, and international documents by historians, sociologists, political scientists, and economists. In addition, Hernon investigates the effect of library characteristics, such as organization, collection arrangement, etc., on the use of documents. The study is based on questionnaires and interviews administered to faculty and librarians at seventeen public and private institutions offering bachelor's through doctoral programs.

Hernon's findings are both enlightening and of tremendous practical value. Social scientists, excluding historians, rely primarily on current publications. All social scientists use only a relatively few types of documents, such as statistical publications,
census reports, congressional hearings and committee prints, court cases, and serial set items. As might be expected, heavy and moderate users of the library are more likely to use documents than are limited users of the library. Hernon discovered that there is no difference in the use patterns of faculty in bachelor's, master's, or doctoral programs. Economists and political scientists are much more likely to make frequent use of documents than historians or sociologists. Regardless of discipline, federal publications are of greatest interest, followed by international and United Nations documents, state documents, foreign documents, and finally, local documents.

Faculty locate documents primarily through citations in the general literature, bibliographies in subject fields, mailing lists of government agencies, and contact with colleagues. Most faculty preferred informal methods of introducing students to documents and, interestingly, 28.3 percent of the respondents never mentioned documents to their students.

Two reasons are offered for not using documents. First, many nonusers believe government agencies publish little of value in their specific field. Second, many nonusers find the problems associated with identifying and accessing documents overshadow any potential value of the documents themselves.

Librarians have long debated the effect of various document classification schemes on document use, and the debate is likely to continue, as Hernon reports that "there is no statistically significant difference between frequency of use and the type of classification scheme employed" (page 103).

Hernon provides a unique and valuable insight into faculty use pattern of documents. Originally a dissertation, the research is thorough and well designed; however, the book could benefit from additional editing, as it still reads as if it were a dissertation. In addition, Hernon's definition of some categories is questionable. Heavy library use, for example, is defined as twenty-plus library visits per year, which seems somewhat low. Finally, one last caveat: "Frequency of faculty use of the library's documents collection is not a good indicator of the use by faculty members of government publications in general" (page 88).

Faculty frequently obtain documents through agencies, colleagues, and other channels.

A welcome addition to the literature, Use of Government Publications by Social Scientists should be read by all documents librarians and librarians responsible for social science collections.—David R. McDonald, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford California.


This UNESCO-funded study describes and compares information systems for government and public administration (ISGPAs) that are intended to aid decision makers. The scope of the work is international and is
based on the assumption that better governmental information systems will produce better decision making. The major point that is stressed throughout the work is “public authorities of developing countries should accord very high priority to planning and introducing modern information systems . . . which could help make their general approach to economic and social planning much more effective” (page 12). The purpose of the book, then, is to provide guidance for planners who are attempting to develop ISGPAs for their governments.

Of the four chapters in the book, the first and the third will have the least interest for information scientists and librarians in the United States. The first provides a historical background to the development of ISGPAs and the third describes a number of ISGPAs in various countries throughout the world. But the meat of the book is contained in chapter two, which describes the flow of information in an ISGPA, and chapter four, which suggests how to plan for the implementation and development of an ISGPA.

Use of models and incorporation of sources throughout these two chapters add to their value. The author stresses that an ISGPA must have unique information characteristics depending on the specific nature of the country it is to serve. From time to time, the author lapses into more of a philosophical commentary rather than detailing specific guidelines or procedures that one might follow to initiate an ISGPA. Such is especially true in chapter four, where more detailed information in a step-by-step approach would assist the author to better accomplish the stated purpose of the book. However, the content in these two chapters, and especially the second, is a useful basic summary of information-processing characteristics and variables.

Unfortunately, a large portion of the information that is contained in the volume cannot be retrieved because (1) there is no subject, author, title index; (2) there is no
bibliography; and (3) there is no index to acronyms—which are used profusely throughout the volume. The paradox is unavoidable: a book on information systems without adequate retrieval systems itself! The well-known time lag of UNESCO publishing limits the currentness of the work. Because the most current references are 1975 and some 1976, readers in 1980 can expect that significant changes have taken place during the interim.

Nonetheless, the author should be congratulated for producing the volume. It provides a useful overview and introduction to international ISGPAs, it provides a basis for the development of ISGPAs, and, perhaps most important, it gives evidence of the importance of ISGPAs for governmental purposes. As such, the volume fills a void in existing literature and should be a welcome addition by those who are interested in the background, status, and development of national and international ISGPAs.—Charles R. McClure, University of Oklahoma, Norman.


The scope of Introduction to Library Technical Services, as defined by Bernhardt in the preface, is broad and attempts not only to cover the "acquiring, cataloging, and processing of all types of library materials" but also to offer a "comprehensive presentation in a relevant manner to all libraries of all sizes and to technical services personnel at all levels."

This is a difficult task and one that I feel the author does not always accomplish. Instead, the resulting text runs the gamut from masterful to disappointing.

High points evolve when the author presents frank, demystifying statements, simple problem-solving approaches, and some very pertinent examples of technical services procedures. At certain times no prior knowledge is assumed, and the definitions take on the proportion of dissections, yielding up fresh, understandable statements about commonsense technical processes that are sometimes considered by the profession to be veiled in mystery.

On the other hand, abbreviations and acronyms, with which our field abounds, are sometimes thrown in, leaving the neophyte uniformed. Some chapters seemed to be completely introductory, as suggested by the title, and others go into such great detail that only a conditioned practitioner can assimilate the examples presented.

When the author chose to present the material in graphic rather than in prose format, the lack of homogeneity continued. Certain charts were clear and well thought out and brought together information from diverse sources that made understanding the concepts much easier. However, other diagrams were very complex and detracted from, rather than added to, the text.

Current technological advances were included but often appended to the practical discussion rather than as a part of it. It seems to me to be a perplexing time in which to write an introductory work on technical services. AACR 2 and the fast-moving pace of technology make it difficult to know what to include in depth and what to mention only in passing.

Bernhardt has presented a good, if somewhat uneven, mix of historical principles, basic practices and procedures, and currently evolving alternatives. I would recommend the text for use in a hands-on practicum-type course in technical services; the high points, of which there were many, will save the instructor much time—time that can be used to fill in some of the lower points.—Dorothy Hagen Kettner, Fergus Falls Community College, Fergus Falls, Minnesota.


Like so many of Pierian Press' other publications, this one profits from the author's years of experience in reference work and library instruction. The book is more than just a good list of research materials in education, because it is "term paper topic-
oriented. Thus, the novice searcher is encouraged to begin at the beginning (topic selection) instead of at the library.

The brief preface is cleverly written in a branching format to isolate users who don’t have the basic entry skills—ability to use the card catalog and the Readers’ Guide and note-taking skills.

Kennedy begins with chapters on topic selection and narrowing of the topic. Why do so many searcher’s manuals take these skills for granted? Their absence is certainly one of the main causes of frustration in question negotiation at the reference desk.

The author uses interest-provoking chapter titles such as “Finding the Best Parts of Books,” “Collecting Current Information,” and “Finding Facts Fast.” The comic strip illustrations, now inevitable in a beginner’s manual, are well selected and not overdone.

Fortunately, much of the bibliographic content is presented in essay form, presumably to avoid those endless annotated lists that weary the eye and threaten the beginning searcher.

Two of the more interesting appendixes are: an outline of a search strategy that proves to be an outline of the book as well, and a brief (too brief, actually) “library knowledge test.”

Kennedy and Pierian Press have produced an attractive, well-bound, well-printed paperback. A good buy for libraries and librarians interested in library instruction, as well as for people doing basic library research in education.—James Doyle, Macomb County Community College, Warren, Michigan.


The pros and cons of sharing library resources in nonindustrialized countries is the subject of these proceedings of a 1977 IFLA seminar. On the whole sharing library resources is only in its adolescence in some Western nations and in infancy or nonexistent in others, especially the nonindustrialized nations. Yet most of the papers from these countries are hopeful and realistic about the prospects of sharing resources on a national and even international regional basis.

However, there do appear to be some prerequisites that have evolved for resource sharing. These prerequisites are: (1) there should be some progress in the country in developing a communications infrastructure; (2) there should be adequate documentary sources as well as records of national inventories of these resources; and (3) there should be professional know-how in any discussion of information sources.

And what about users? There must be users, plus professionals who understand fully user needs and abilities. J. S. Parker makes a good case for the need to correct the neglected user by advocating behavioral recognition. In fact, he sees the user as very much part of the system of sharing library resources.
resources. He notes that "whether or not we are prepared to regard the user as a feasible subject for library resource sharing programmes depends in part upon how we view his place in the library system, and how we choose to define library resources" (p.15).

Nigeria is fast becoming a leader in library development according to S. B. Aje, who points out cogently that his country has many of the ingredients for launching a nationwide program of resource sharing, including cooperative acquisitions. Alma Jordan of Trinidad points out that the Caribbean has experienced some success in cooperation in the areas of published regional bibliography and cooperative acquisitions. There have been great strides made in the area of sharing human resources, also, through ACURIL (Association of Caribbean University and Research Libraries) and the Caribbean Commission, which maintains a library component.

It is inspiring to learn from John Yocklunn, the national librarian of Papua New Guinea, that the national library of that nation will not follow the traditional or Western mode of leadership in library development. Yocklunn has already embarked on a philosophy of making the national library in reality a national library service and thus having a very important role and responsibility in fostering library cooperation throughout the nation and among all libraries regardless of type.

Papers by Khurshid of Pakistan, Kalia of India, and Soltania of Iran raise hard questions about "processing centres" for documentary sources. Is it unrealistic for nonindustrial nations to contemplate seriously using OCLC? Fred Kilgour and Henriette Avram were no doubt sincere when they talked about library automation and all of its sophisticated technological advancements. But were these discussions of American technological storage and retrieval achievements appropriate for this meeting?

In all honesty, this report leaves this reviewer in a quandary as to its true value. At times the gems of wisdom from the West sound patronizing and guilty of cultural imperialism. The mere use of the term developing countries (developing almost always seems to mean countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and The Pacific Islands) in the book's title implies that the nonindustrialized nations are not yet quite “Europeanized” and therefore are still in the "developing" stage. That is why this book can disturb one intellectually. But on a pragmatic level it does have value; it gives a cogent statement about the state of the art of resource sharing from an international perspective.—Miles M. Jackson, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu.


"Like most professions, we have been reluctant to see ourselves in print as we see ourselves in life" (p.23). If Ollé developed no other point in this little volume, the book would still be worth the price. Fortunately, there is more. For example, “[library history] is closed circuit history. If it is not by librarians for librarians, it is by historians for librarians" (p.26); and "The first challenge to library biography is to interest the library profession at large. The second is to interest the public. Neither is near to being met" (p.76).

Between these accurate observations the author weaves a state-of-the-art examination of the library history literature emanating from Great Britain and the United States. (In the process, however, he exhibits a heavy bias toward Great Britain, upon whose library history literature he repeatedly calls for examples to demonstrate certain points.) He selects his citations carefully (one would gain little by quibbling over certain exclusions) and fits them into a general organizational framework consisting of seven chapters.

The first serves as an introduction to the next three, which discuss the library history literature falling into three broad categories: "time, place, type of library, type of activity"; the "individual library"; and the "biographical approach."

Three concluding chapters discuss "compiling and editing," reference aids to study and research" (unfortunately the book had gone to press too late for an extended analysis of several recently published aids), and "preparing a text for submission."
Although Olle renders definite service in his accurate picture of the state of the art, he fails on two other accounts by omission. He should have mentioned several of those published works that he believes represent the weaker side of library history (“see ourselves in print as we see ourselves in life” comes to mind here); he could have engaged in a lengthier discussion on the utility of the library history. The reader would have benefitted from both.

Still, the shortcomings are minor; the book comes highly recommended especially for the library history neophyte, but seasoned library historians would not be hurt by a generous perusal of its pages.—Wayne A. Wiegand, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Team Librarianship. Papers Given at the Library Association Northern Branch/Association of Assistant Librarians North Division Joint Annual Weekend School at Otterburn Hall, October 13th, 14th, 15th 1978. Edited by R. M. Major and P. M. Judd. Newcastle upon Tyne: Association of Assistant Librarians (Northern Division), 1979. 112p. £1.50 (not including postage). Available from: P. M. Judd, Publications Officer, AAL Northern Division, Polytechnic Library, Ellison Building, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST.

These papers, delivered at a 1978 British workshop, provide an introduction to the origin, purpose, and merits of “team librarianship.” Team librarianship involves the assignment of professionals to small special purpose teams that develop goals and policies through consensus rather than through the traditional hierarchical approach.

Teams operate in the community rather than inside libraries. Emphasis is on exploitation of resources rather than on their management. Nonprofessionals supervise daily library operations, while professionals spend most of their time in the community with their various constituencies.

Six of the papers describe the experiences several British public library systems have had with team librarianship. The seventh paper, by an academic librarian who seems somewhat perplexed by the public librarians...
surrounding him, argues that subject specialization is an academic variation of team librarianship.

One deduces that the idea of team librarianship was *post* rather than *propter hoc*. An emerging concern for professionalism among British librarians, joined to the circumstance of the consolidation of large numbers of small libraries into public library systems, made new approaches just as desirable in Britain as in the U.S. Team librarianship proved effective in identifying community needs, in increasing use, and in enhancing the librarian’s professional self-respect.

Predictably, there are pitfalls: too many meetings, too little contact between librarians and patrons in the library, support staff coming to believe that librarians are superfluous to the library’s operation.

American public librarians have dealt with comparable situations in some similar ways, but academic librarians have not. This book could be very helpful to academic librarians, however, since, if only by indirect means of improving services in academic libraries. Should academic librarians transfer their offices to faculty office buildings? Should they cruise dormitories, student unions, and dining halls, seeking out potential users? Should they hire (and pay well!) administrative professionals to handle routine elements in ILL, binding, and overdues?

Though “team librarianship” may be only a new phrase for some old ideas, this particular book, whatever its flaws in style and content, raises some important questions about what we librarians should be trying to accomplish. It’s a volume that would spark ideas in librarians in any kind of institution.—Peter Dollard, Alma College, Alma, Michigan.


Each decade presents libraries with challenges and problems, each problem seemingly more difficult than the last. Librarians respond to such situations in a positive, goal-oriented manner. Very often the solution to a problem or the answer to a challenge is the formulation of new services. The turbulence of the sixties and the seventies altered many of the traditional perceptions of library service. Increasingly, librarians base their services on the needs of the community, rather than on traditions.

Margaret Monroe and Kathleen Heim have compiled and edited a collection of articles that trace the emergence of community-oriented services. The core article, “Emerging Patterns of Community Service,” by Monroe, ties the issue together: providing an insight into the history of various evolutions in service as well as describing the elements of a typical service pattern.

Thomas Shaughnessy continues the groundwork for the issue in “Library Administration in Support of Emerging Service Patterns.” Rather than concentrating on the patterns of community services, he focuses on the systems within which the patterns function.

The third leg of the tripod on which this issue is based is Leigh Estabrook’s “Emerging Trends in Community Library Services.” Estabrook synthesizes Monroe and Shaughnessy, relating the question of the failure of many community services that emerged in the sixties and seventies with the question of the relevance of the traditionally accepted goals of librarianship.

The balance of the issue investigates individual instances of emerging services. With rare coordination, each article deals with those services from a societal, professional, or organizational point of view. The eleven articles deal with many aspects of librarianship.

Because of the theme, “Emerging Patterns of Community Service,” the majority of the articles deal with the prime center of community-based service—the public library. Each article contributes to the overall impression that libraries do not stand alone or aside from society as cultural depositories, but interact with their environment.

Articles such as “Literacy Education as Library Community Service,” by Helen Lyman, “Uses of Bibliotherapy,” by Rhea
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The contributors as a group have provided the reader with timely and appropriate examples drawn from excellent bibliographies. The volume as a whole balances succinct histories of services with predictions of their eventual success or failure. Together the selections create a statement about change and adaptation, giving the reader a sense of the universality of the patterns of service and the necessity of continual change.—Damaris Ann Schmitt, Meramec Community College Library, St. Louis, Missouri.


Individuals currently in supervisory positions and those aspiring to become supervisors will find these proceedings stimulating and potentially useful. The intuitive beliefs of the authors, reinforced by their own supervisory experiences, are the mainstay of this work. The authors also make use of appropriate research results to support key viewpoints. Supervisory issues discussed cover the gamut from the theoretical to the practical.

On the whole this is a needed and important contribution to library management literature. Authors and the titles of their contributions give the scope of the volume: "The Importance of Good Supervision in Libraries" (Hugh C. Atkinson), "Contributions from the Theory of Administration toward Understanding the Process of Supervision: Barth's Distinction" (Lars Larson), "The Research Basis of Employee-Centered Supervision" (Richard J. Vorwerk), "An Overview of Supervision in Libraries Today" (Martha J. Bailey), "Leadership and Employee Motivation" (Donald J. Sager),
"The Role of the Supervisor in Training and Developing Staff" (David R. Dowell), "Making the Transition from Employee to Supervisor" (Panel Presentation), "Interaction Skills and the Modern Supervisor" (Richard Calabrese), "Handling Employee Problems" (Elaine M. Albright), and "Equal Employment Opportunity Principles and Affirmative Action Principles in Library Supervision" (Agnes M. Griffen).

While the volume encompasses a variety of supervisory topics, several themes tend to be repeated. Often addressed as insights or guidelines to effective supervision, they include: (1) the importance of evaluation, training, and motivation as essential to include characteristics and predispositions of the employees and the supervisor, (2) the need to study the situation, defined broadly to include characteristics and predispositions of the employees and the supervisor, the nature of the tasks supervised, and other significant factors in the work situation; and (3) the importance of making people feel recognized and worthwhile.

Another recurring theme stressed by several of the authors concerns the limitations of library supervisors as found in the library research literature and from their own observations. David Dowell probably hits the nail on the head as well as anyone in his comments on the failure of library supervisors to fulfill their training and other supervisory responsibilities, as follows: "Many see themselves as workers first and supervisors second. They fail to realize that supervising is as much their responsibility as is the work of their unit. They feel guilty if they are not doing as much of the routine work as their subordinates. Therefore, little time and energy are left for uniquely supervisory activities" (p.65).

A highlight of the collection is a section candidly summarizing the reactions of five (three in university libraries) recently appointed supervisors to their new responsibilities. The transition from employee to supervisor is vicariously described along with the inevitable attendant problems they had in adjusting to former peers and even supervisors. Their attempts to solve these and other problems are interesting and should be valuable to others in similar situations.—Michael B. Binder, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford, New Jersey.


These Selected Studies in Bibliography, selected by Tanselle, himself, upon the initiative of the Society, consist of eleven articles reproduced by offset from their appearance originally in Studies in Bibliography over a sixteen-year period, 1963–79. As such, they represent but a fraction of Tanselle's contributions to both the theory and practice of bibliography as well as to textual criticism. Formerly a member of the English faculty at the University of Wisconsin and more recently named as vice-president of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, he has become a major figure in American bibliography. His two-volume Guide to the Study of United States Imprints (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1971) is characteristic of his thoroughness and industry.

This particular collection of papers, by design I suspect, falls into three divisions. The first three articles (dating from 1969, 1974, and 1977) are devoted to "studies of the theory and tools of bibliography, chiefly descriptive." The three following (from 1967, 1970, and 1971) are concerned with the "analyses of the problems that occur in dealing with bindings and paper in descriptive bibliography." Five articles (1972–79) examining "textual criticism and editing" round out the work. All reflect admirably Tanselle's "extraordinary thoroughness and copiousness of investigation."

The man's intake, intelligent structuring, and elucidation of all things bibliographical is prodigious. His "Descriptive Bibliography and Library Cataloging" indicates he knows at least as well as some professional catalogers (and better than some others) the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules and their applicability to rare book cataloging. Few catalogers, however, aside from those associated with the select number of truly significant rare book libraries, will find themselves able to indulge in the labor-intensive descriptive cataloging procedures he advocates. (It should be noted, however, that Tanselle is no ivory tower
Theoretician. He is a member of the ad hoc committee in the Independent Research Library Association, formed in 1978, the chief concern of which is the increasing application of machine-assisted cataloging, and its inadequacies, to rare book and research collections.

Tanselle occupies a unique place in American bibliography, as readers of *Studies in Bibliography, The Library, Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, and other similar publications over the last two decades already know. His scholarship in the specialized areas of historical bibliography, analytical bibliography, descriptive bibliography, and textual criticism or scholarly editing has been firmly established. The reprinting here of such articles as his "Copyright Records and the Bibliographer," "A System of Color Identification for Bibliographic Description," "The Bibliographical Description of Paper," "Some Principles for Editorial Apparatus," and others serve to substantiate his position, if any substantialization were necessary.

At the same time, Tanselle is concerned with the broader concepts of bibliography and the interrelationships of the group of subjects comprising it that happen to be referred to by the same term. He is a codifier, as his "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature" suggests. What is more, he is a strong advocate. If there exists a single common thread running throughout this collection of articles, it is Tanselle's insistent urging for cooperation and communication among bibliographers of diverse approaches and concerns.

In "The State of Bibliography Today," a paper delivered by Tanselle at the annual meeting of the Bibliographical Society of America in January 1979 in New York, he again decried the parochial and divisive tendencies and occasional lapses from rigorous scholarly standards that sometimes mar bibliography today: "The historian of printing machinery, the editor of literary texts, the collector of private press books, and the library cataloger must be able to exchange ideas—must do so, in fact, more than they do now—for their fortunes, and those of all other students of the book, are tied together." This is something that needs repeating and we'll undoubtedly find it repeated, by Tanselle himself, should he choose to revise these pieces for future publication in a consolidated general survey.

It might appear to be not a little ironic that a collection such as this of Tanselle's, devoted as it is to the study of the book as a physical object, and published for the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, should be issued with any flaws. The copy received here was missing two pages, between 138 and 139, supplied in photocopy for reviewing purposes. Tanselle's position in American bibliography is in no way affected by this publishing flaw though. These selected reprintings serve rather to confirm his place.—*John F. Guido, Washington State University, Pullman.*


**Book Collecting: A Modern Guide** serves as a manual on specific book collecting practices. The preface, the introduction, and particularly the first chapter, "What Book Collecting Is All About," by William Matheson (Library of Congress) provide an interesting introduction to the more specific chapters that follow.

Robin Halwas in chapter 2, "Buying Books from Dealers," provides nothing new for the collector or librarian and makes a questionable observation about most dealers being reluctant to sell to persons they don't like. Chapter 3, "Buying at Auction," is written by Robert Wilson (Phoenix Book Shop, N.Y.). He presents an interesting account of auction practices, the role of the dealer representing a collector, and the importance of timing when buying and selling.

In less than fifteen pages Robert Rosenthal (University of Chicago) writes about "The Antiquarian Book Market"—hardly doing justice to the booksellers and collectors active in that market. In "The Art and Craft of Collecting Manuscripts" Lola Szladits (New York Public Library) provides a technical and philosophical discussion.
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Terry Belanger (Columbia University) attempts to be brief in his contribution on "Descriptive Bibliography"—one aspect of the entire book scene that does not lend itself to brevity or simplification. Yet, he offers a readable account of a very technical area.

No manual on book collecting would be complete without a discussion of "Fakes and Forgeries," and this is provided by Joan Friedman (Yale Center for British Art). She is quick to point to the proper concern of the collector about authenticity and provides helpful suggestions for making such determinations. The following chapter, "Physical Care of Books and Manuscripts," is timely. Collectors and librarians are just beginning to realize the dimensions of the preservation problem. Most of the information is available elsewhere but is presented here in a concise manner and from the collector's viewpoint.

The editor's own contribution, "Organizing a Collection," is certainly one of the better chapters. It is organization that really allows a group of materials to be described as a collection or library. Katharine and Daniel Leab (American Book Prices Current) have supplied a brief, understandable section on "Appraisal."

Next Susan Thompson in "The Book Collector in the World of Scholarship" speaks of the real debt owed to personal collectors throughout history. Thompson notes the positive influence of the Grolier Club on the book arts and gives a good survey of a number of scholarly organizations whose interest to book collectors is apparent. She points to the specific involvement of collectors in the academic education process and observes that library special collections are frequently dependent on the collector but that, "Collectors can live without libraries, although they may find them useful, while the libraries would not have been born if collectors had not existed."

The final chapter of Book Collecting: A Modern Guide deals specifically with "The Literature of Book Collecting." G. Thomas Tanselle speaks of a short survey, but this consists of sixty pages. Tanselle acknowledges the central place of John Carter in the literature of book collecting—as do several of the contributors in this and the companion volume.

In Collectible Books: Some New Paths Jean Peters has edited a book that serves not only as a companion to the earlier volume but also as a sequel to the classic, New Paths in Book Collecting, edited by John Carter (1934). The introduction for Collectible Books is entitled "A Backward Look: The Sadleir Circle in Perspective" and is written by Percy Muir, who, along with John Carter and Graham Pollard, was one of the regular attendants at the Sadleir Circle in the early 1930s. This reminiscence is at times difficult to follow because of obscure references that are, no doubt, readily understood by the real bookman.

G. Thomas Tanselle contributes the first chapter in Collectible Books. "Non-Firsts" is very thorough and technical in places, and this is typical of Tanselle—as all can attest.
who have read his "The Bibliographical Concepts of Issue and State" (Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America 69:17–66 [1975]). One of Tanselle's more interesting accounts is of the project to collect Melville at the Newberry Library and the importance of "non-firsts" in that project.

The new path to collectible books for Charles Gulland and John Espey is "American Trade Bindings and Their Designers, 1880–1915." They include numerous citations to books that are examples of an individual designer's work. As is the practice for all chapters in Collectible Books, the references, footnotes, and further reading provide an excellent bibliography.

William Todd in "Books in Series" gives Sir Walter Scott credit for the term series in the sense we now prefer but notes that Scott is collected for Scott, not because his works appeared in a series.

Collectors interested in books in series would probably find much in common with those interested in "American Mass-Market Paperbacks." Thirty-three pages are required for Thomas Bonn to cover adequately this exciting area of collecting. The plates supplied for this chapter as well as the chapter on "American Trade Binding" add significantly to the worth of each.

Collectible Books includes chapters on three very specialized areas—"Film Books," "Photography as Book Illustration," and "Book Catalogues." The editor's contribution is "Publishers' Imprints." The accounts of the Hogarth Press and Penguin imprints are particularly interesting. Peter Howard relates the experience of two booksellers (himself included) who issued separate catalogs on "American Fiction Since 1960." The response to those offerings is analyzed by Howard and enlarged upon, resulting in an excellent survey of current American fiction from the collector's viewpoint. To illustrate what he has written, Howard includes accounts of the approaches of four anonymous collectors in their pursuit of current fiction.

Together, Book Collecting: A Modern Guide and Collectible Books: Some New Paths can serve as a state of the art for the field of book collecting. The excellent quality of certain chapters plus the outstanding bibliographical enhancements makes both books quite useful and "collectible."—Don Lanier, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb.


A librarian and an interior designer (turned librarian) have produced a very basic book for individuals who are involved in their first project in remodeling, renovation, or new building planning. It covers subjects, such as floor plans, traffic flow, use of color, fabrics, wall coverings, window treatment, floor coverings, storage, merchandising, and some odds and ends of information. The authors suggest some inexpensive ways to handle problems of older buildings.

Useful illustrations are placed throughout the book. Standard floor plan symbols are used. Drawings are acceptable, but photographs are poorly reproduced. Color would have been helpful, particularly in the section that deals with this subject. However,
those two factors were probably responsible for keeping the cost of the book at a level affordable by those who really need it. A small basic glossary of design terms is included.

This book has some excellent information, but it is so basic that it can be recommended only to people who have had no opportunity to work with library interiors, with the hope that it will inspire them to read further.—D. Joleen Bock, Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina.


This annual record seems to be a logical extension of the periodic reports and major market studies that have been produced by Knowledge Industry Publications for the book publishing industry. (See the review of Benjamin M. Compaine’s The Book Industry in Transition, College & Research Libraries 40:384–86 [July 1979].) Current information on book publishing exists in a variety of scattered sources, so it is with anticipation that the librarian opens this new “one-source reference.”

The physical format is pleasing. Charts and tables are easily read and well spaced; boldface has been used effectively for headings and emphasis within the text. The twenty sections are clearly defined, and sources of data are carefully noted.

The volume begins with a month-by-month chronology from January 1978 through June 1979 of news items; mergers and acquisitions appear again in a separate listing. The expected statistical analysis of the book industry begins with an overall review of receipts, sales, exports and imports, number of titles published, and book prices. Most charts are complete through 1978, and book prices are projected for 1979. The number of titles published for 1978 is a preliminary figure, and no subject analysis is given.

A section on the leading book publishers is followed by five-year financial summaries of forty-nine selected publicly owned publishers/printers. Another section, on cost factors, will be of major interest to librarians because paper prices, book printer wages, and shipping rates are outlined. Also noteworthy is the section on market indicators, education, libraries, retail bookstores, and direct-to-consumer sales.

This issue also contains sections on international publishing, education in book publishing, best-sellers, notable subsidiary rights transactions, authors’ advances and royalties, book trade associations, employment and salaries in book publishing, an annotated bibliography of recent books on book publishing, and finally, a fifty-five-page directory of 1,200 book publishers in the U.S. that lists name, address, phone number, and a very general indication of type of material published.

This first issue pulls together many meaningful statistics, lists, and facts from a range of sources: Knowledge Industry Publications reports, publications of the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Publishers Weekly, Bowker Annual, etc. However, it is not yet a complete “one-
source” reference work. Its directory, for example, will not replace that of *Literary Marketplace*. Nor will its statistics on titles published replace those Bowker cumulations by subject in *Publishers Weekly* and the *Bowker Annual*.

Noticeably lacking is any reference to scholarly publishing except in total sales and in the directory. University presses are a small segment of the book industry, but their status is of vital interest to the academic librarian. Omitted from the chronology and the annotated bibliography are the report of the National Enquiry, *Scholarly Communication* (Johns Hopkins, 1979) and Fritz Machlup's *Information through the Printed Word* (Praeger, 1978), the first volume of which is devoted to and entitled *Book Publishing*. Also surprising is the lack of notice given to the two readership surveys undertaken in 1978, by Yankelovich, Skelly and White for the Book Industry Study Group and by Gallup for the American Library Association.

In summary, it seems as if the editors have not yet found the focus for this annual. It probably cannot be all inclusive, but there should be a place for a continuing in-depth statistical analysis of the economics of book publishing. Until then, librarians will be better served, in these days of tight budgets, by continued use of the sources at hand rather than investing in a new subscription.—Mary E. Thatcher, University of Connecticut, Storrs.


*Peoplework* should constitute required reading not only for its intended (target) audience, but for all who regardless of profession or occupation would wish to learn the secret of better understanding themselves and others. That the authors did, however, aim their book toward the library profession rather than any other is simply explained: (1) one of the authors is a librarian (the other is a psychologist), and (2) librarians are the human connection between people and their information or knowledge needs. Thus, according to the authors, the success of the library is in direct ratio to the ability of the library's staff to relate positively to the people who use it.

This book is about communication—humanistic communication. Basic interpersonal, intrapersonal, and group communication concepts are dealt with, and by extension this book can be said to cover the organizational, mass, and inter- and intracultural contexts. The authors use a heavy arsenal of theoretical documentation to back up their points. It is not the most easy book to read; rather it must be read, cogitated, and digested.

The latter phase of the process (digestion) is greatly facilitated by the problem-solving exercises that are found at the end of virtually every chapter, greatly enhancing the book's value to the reader.

In fact, the authors graciously invite feedback in the form of comments, criticisms, problems, and solutions to all unanticipated or unaddressed areas that appear or should appear in their book, thus closing the communication loop and making the exchange between them and their readers dynamic.

The fundamental premise of this book is that education must come to grips with both the affective and the cognitive domain. Hence, it is posited that one cannot sort out a person's feelings, values, and attitudes from individual thought processes, or to put it another way, a person's fantasies and emotions are inextricably interwoven into his or her intellectual processes. This realization on the part of educators constitutes a giant step toward teaching people to learn how to think for themselves and to be in control of their own emotions, making them whole and creative human beings capable of learning, thinking, and understanding throughout their lives.

The authors introduce a number of models that tie into three pivotal variables: confluence, competence, and creativity. Notably among these models are Jones’ and Samples’ theories of affective education; the values clarification model; the self-awareness/self-esteem models; problem-solving models; group dynamics models; and others. This book is highly recommended for all libraries, both institutional and personal.—Mary B. Cassata, State University of New York at Buffalo.
ABRAHAMS MAGAZINE SERVICE has been serving the needs of periodical librarians since 1889 and we are very proud of our international reputation for integrity and performance. We are now expanding our Book Department and are prepared to handle your orders for new books and reprints. We would be happy to have you phone or write us for any information that you might need.
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(212) 777-4700
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Library Instruction to EOP Students: A Case Study. By Ilene F. Rockman. 1978. 9p. ED 174 211. MF—$0.83; PC—$1.82.

Since 1976, a ten-week, one-credit formal course in library instruction has been taught to entering Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) students at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, as an integral part of their core curriculum. The curriculum for these disadvantaged students places emphasis upon communication processes—reading, writing, speaking, and listening; and faculty from the departments of English, history, speech communication, and the library coordinate their lectures, instructional strategies, and assignments during the quarter to ensure an integrated learning experience for each student. Requirements for students in the library skills class do not differ significantly from those for non-EOP students; the course stresses "survival skills" for locating resources and methodically formulating a search strategy when approaching any topic for term paper or report. Instructional strategies include use of audiovisual materials, demonstrations, discussion, educational games, guest speakers, individualized instruction, learning activity packages, lecture, problem solving, questioning, review and practice, self-paced material, and simulations. A list of references useful in developing this course is provided.


This script of a slide-tape presentation, which describes the selection and processing of materials for a university library, includes commentary with indicators for specific slide placement. Distinction is made between books and serial publications, and the materials are followed from the ordering decision through processing. The role of the librarian in the selection process, the automated acquisitions system, and cataloging (original or from OCLC) are highlighted.


As librarians cope with reduced budgets, decreased staff, and increased demands for services, microcomputers will take a significant role in library automation by providing low-cost systems, solving specific library problems, and performing in distributed systems. This report presents an introduction to the technology of this low-cost, miniature computer and a description of its specific applications in libraries. The use of such computers in circulation, acquisition, serials control, reference, administration, and audiovisual services is covered, and current and probable future uses of the microcomputer in each of these areas are described. References are listed at the end of each chapter, and appendices provide glossaries of computer and library terms and a list of vendors supplying automated library systems.


This proposed policy manual for the computerized information retrieval service of the University of Houston System outlines policies for specific elements of its operation: (1) users—who is is not eligible for service and for equipment use; (2) cost—rates charged; (3) responsibilities of searchers—maintenance of searching skills, scheduling of appointments and interviews, the search, the postsearch; (4) responsibilities of the coordinator—compiling statistical reports, liaison and contact, arrangement of equipment repairs and maintenance, publicity, supervision, recommendations; (5) responsibilities of the office secretary—service to patrons, record keeping; (6) responsibilities of the library administration—staffing, funding; (7) complaints; (8) policy approval and change. An appendix describes methods of payment for computer searches conducted at the University of Houston Libraries.

Proceedings of a Workshop on Area Patterns for Resource Sharing. Div. of Library Services, Wisconsin State Dept. of
A Concise Guide to the Process and Mate­rials, a list of workshop participants, and
administrators of libraries, library staff members, and
network representatives from all types and sizes
of libraries in all areas of Wisconsin participated
in a workshop to investigate alternative structures
for providing interlibrary loan and reference re­ferral services at the state and area levels. These
proceedings from the workshop present the texts
of the four speakers’ addresses on the definition
of resource sharing, resource sharing and new
technology, state-level library resource develop­ment, and alternative patterns for resource shar­ing (unstructured, clearinghouse, multiple re­source center). Also included is a description of
the small group discussions session that consid­ered the ideal patterns for each of nine geographical areas of the state. Summaries of those dis­cussions are presented in tables that list the dis­advantages and advantages of each pattern by the
number of groups citing them. Appendixes pro­vide the workshop agenda, workshop goal and ob­jectives, a list of workshop participants, and
summaries of small group discussions by geo­graphical area.

Theses and Dissertations: A Student’s Guide
to General Bibliographic Sources Avail­able in the McGill Libraries. Comp. by
Suzy M. Slavin. McLennan Library,
McGill University, Montreal. 1979. 10p.
ED 174 237. MF—$0.83; PC—$1.82.

Four guides and ten national and institutional
listings of bibliographic sources for locating theses
and dissertations are described for the user of the
McGill Libraries. Annotated listings cover na­tional and institutional bibliographic sources in
Canada, as well as national sources in the United
States, Australia, France, Germany, Great Brit­ain, Ireland, India, the Soviet Union, Sweden,
and Switzerland. Information for obtaining copies
of dissertations is provided.

A Comparison of Cost Factors Used by
OCLC Service Centers. By Leslie R.
Morris. 1979. 16p. ED 174 238. MF—
$0.83; PC—$1.82.

Data were gathered on the costs charged by
various service centers that contract OCLC ser­vices to individual libraries, and charges were
compared at the levels of 3,000, 10,000, and
20,000 FTUs per year. (An FTU is the first time
a library uses a cataloging record to catalog a title
in its collection.) It was concluded that OCLC
contracting service centers charge various rates
according to the volume of FTUs used; with
low-volume users generally charged more per
FTU than high-volume users. Although FTU
costs generally decreased from 1977-78 to 1978-79,
some users had their prices increased. A sample
questionnaire is appended.

The Effect of On-Line Search Services on
Chemists’ Information Style. By Gerald
Jahoda and others. Florida State Univer­sity, Tallahassee. 1979. 325p. ED 174
240. MF—$0.83; PC—$19.87.

On-line searches of bibliographic data bases
were conducted for scientists and technologists in
one academic and one industrial setting. In order
to determine the effect of this new technological
development on its users’ information-seeking
habits and to determine how, how often, and
with what satisfaction on-line search services are
used, records of use were maintained, and both
users and nonusers of the on-line search service
in the two environments were surveyed prior to
the start and at the conclusion of the project’s
first phase. In the first phase, free, mediated
(searched by information specialists) search ser­vice was provided; in the second phase, mediated
search service at half the computer connect and
off-line printing costs was provided; and in the
third phase, free searches were conducted by
final user of the information. No striking change
in information style that held true for both set­tings could be identified. Data on more than 900
uses of on-line search service by almost 200 users
are broken down and analyzed by such factors as
information sources used prior to requesting on­line search service; amount of negotiation time
required; number of unretrieved relevant docu­ments; and user satisfaction with currency, size,
and utility of search output.

The Expected Role of Beginning Librarians:
A Comparative Analysis from Adminis­trators, Educators, and Young Profes­sionals. Proceedings of a Conference. Ed.
by R. Wilburn Clouse. Education Com­mittee, Tennessee Library Assn.,
The papers included in this volume constitute the proceedings of a conference on the theme of the expected role of the professional librarian in an academic library, a public library, a school library, and a special library. Grouped under these four different library headings, the papers present the viewpoints of library administrators, library science educators, and young practicing professionals and provide a comparative analysis of the expected roles.

Report on the Study of Library Use at Pitt by Professor Allen Kent, et al. (A Pittsburgh Reply.) By Murdo J. MacLeod and Casimir Barkowski. Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1979. 51p. ED 178 100. MF—$0.83; PC—$4.82.

This report from the Senate Library Committee at the University of Pittsburgh evaluates a study of monograph and periodical use conducted at Pitt by Allen Kent and his associates from 1975 to 1977 (published as The Use of Library Materials: The University of Pittsburgh Study [New York: Marcel Dekker, 1979]). Areas of the study that are examined include structure in text and footnotes; experimental design; execution; and manipulation of data, in terms of holdings, use, and costs. In particular, the use of sampling, accuracy of "official figures," comparative method, and cost-benefit model of the study are questioned. The Kent study had produced conclusions the committee consider invalid: that Pittsburgh libraries are spending too much money on books and periodicals that are seldom or never used. Findings of the Kent study represent impetus for a change in acquisitions policy, but the committee strongly discourages acceptance of these recommendations because it feels that the study is improperly presented and contains some inaccuracies.

The Status of Status: The Status of Librarians in Texas Academic Libraries. By Jo Anne Hawkins and others. Univ. of Texas at Austin Libraries, Austin. 1978. 65p. ED 178 042. MF—$0.83; PC—$4.82

This report presents the findings of a survey that sought to relate the status of Texas academic librarians to national standards. Consisting of seventy questions in seven categories—identification of library staff, general (status), appointment, promotion and tenure, professional development, governance, and benefits—the survey was based, in part, on the ACRL 1971 Standards for College and University Librarians. Questionnaires were sent to all 144 academic libraries in Texas, includ-
serve the handicapped, (5) rationalization of resources, (6) role of library services to the handicapped, (7) design of facilities to accommodate the handicapped, and (8) delivery of library services to the handicapped.

**Final Report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Subject Analysis of African and Asian Materials.** Subject Analysis Committee, Cataloging and Classification Section, Resources and Technical Services Division, ALA. By Arline Zuckerman and others. American Library Assn., Resources and Technical Services Div., Chicago, Ill. 1978. 107p. ED 175 391. MF—$0.83; PC—$7.82.

Six general recommendations reflect the findings from this final report on subject analysis of African and Asian library materials: (1) more specificity of headings, especially subdivisions and unique terms, is needed; (2) more attention should be given to Asian and African materials, using available expertise; (3) efforts to eliminate offensive terms and to avoid Western orientation in establishing new terminology should be continued; (4) more guidance should be given to catalogers, and thus to library users, through increased history and scope notes made available through the depository set, Library of Congress (LC) subject headings, and LC names headings; (5) use of appropriate local term for culture-specific concepts and, conversely, use of English for concepts with multicultural status when appropriate English term exists, accompanied by cross-references should be attempted; and (6) guidelines to established principles should be widely distributed and consistency of application heavily encouraged. More specific suggestions are provided in the accompanying individual subject reports on East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Middle East and North Africa, and Africa (south of the Sahara).


More than 8,000 miles of travel and more than sixty hours of interview time with various library staff members at eighteen United States academic libraries were involved in this study of gift and exchange functions and their organization and accomplishment. This study focuses on the extent to which material can be acquired through gift and exchange arrangements, describes the relevance of such material to academic research collections, and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of using gifts and exchanges as a means of acquisition. Sections review the historical setting, gift and exchange policies, functions, the organization of gift and exchange work, gift and exchange staffing, specific considerations, and statistical and budgetary considerations.

**Bibliographic Instruction within Library and Discipline Associations: A Survey of Contact Persons and Committees.** By Anne K. Beaubien. Assn. of College and Research Libraries, Chicago, Ill. 1979. 31p. ED 175 468. MF—$0.83; PC—$3.32.

The ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section Committee on Cooperation sent questionnaires to library and professional associations in various academic disciplines to identify existing groups concerned with bibliographic instruction. The first questionnaire, sent to current chairs of all ACRL sections, chapters, and discussion groups and to other ALA divisions and selected round tables, indicated that thirteen ALA-related units have a committee for instruction. Only two units mentioned a discipline association with an instruction committee. Three library associations outside the ALA, according to the responses to the second questionnaire, have instruction committees or involvement. Nineteen of seventy-four professional associations in all major disciplines met at least one of the criteria listed in questionnaire three to determine concerns for library instruction and information. Acting upon these findings, the Subcommittee on Professional Organizations should concentrate on communication and cooperation within ACRL and ALA, initiating contact with discipline associations and establishing a joint committee with the Special Libraries Association.


This report presents and discusses the findings of a study, undertaken at the Education Library of Wayne State University in 1977, that tested library user acceptance of a selected group of current journals in a microfiche format. Problems and conditions of the study, the environment of the Education Library, and methodology are considered; data, in the form of statistical tables and charts, are provided for the three consecutive academic quarters of the study.
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OTHER PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST TO ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

Provides citations to 37,000 books on the visual arts published or distributed in the U.S. 1950–1979. The international Permanent Collection Catalog Index gives dates, prices and publishers/distributors for more than 3,300 catalogs.


Identifies 200 eponyms (words derived from the names of people) and provides the source and origin of the eponym with details of how and when it came into use.


International library guide that lists and describes 858 books and articles on alternatives to industrial society or people who write on that subject. The author feels that convivial tools are a new discipline that explores old, new, and possible tools that will enhance the generation of use-values rather than the production of commodities. "This new discipline deals with the cultural, social, and political conditions under which use-value oriented modern tools can and will be widely used. . . ."

Recent Publications / 285

$120/set; $150 after July 1, 1980. LC 47-3282. ISBN 0-8156-2204-X.


Provides author/title access to 1.2 million book reviews that have appeared in 458 scholarly journals in history, political science, and sociology.


Latest volume in the series.


Provides citations to critical and analytic material on musical compositions.


Provides 2,900 articles on people, ideas, and movements that have shaped the South. The history of each Southern state is also included.


Catalog of self-help organizations providing a statement of the organizations' aims and operations, along with addresses and phone numbers for those who wish more information. Some of the groups included are Alcoholics Anonymous, Parents without Partners, and children's aid groups.


Provides information on the production, consumption, uses, and prices of precious metals and explains in a nontechnical way the major factors influencing the metal markets.

V.4 (Developmental Psychology) and 6 (Psychopathology) are in press.

Proposed two-volume work designed to analyze major issues concerning communication law. In addition to a bibliography of books and journal articles on communication law, major court cases are described and analyzed. Volume II, journalistic Freedom, is to be published later in 1980.


Volume 1 in an ongoing, multivolume series designed to be the first collection of comprehensive, annotated bibliographies of works by and on Canada's major French and English authors from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.


"Alphabetical listing of 51,412 librarians, heads of library networks and consortia, and deans and chairmen of library schools and departments of library science in the United States and Canada." Provides person's name, the library and/or institution with which the person is affiliated, its city and state location, and the telephone number at which the individual may be contacted.


V.1 (19p.): Text. V.2 (32p.): Appendices and Summaries of Responses. Available from: Central Library Services, University of London, Senate House, Malet St., London WC1E 7HU.


Provides biographies of many major and minor national personalities who appear on the postage stamps of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia.

Patterson, Lewis D. Benefits of Collegiate Cooperation: A Digest of the Costs and Benefits of Interinstitutional Programs with Consortium Case Studies and Guidelines. University, Ala.: Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, 1979. 27p. Single copies available free of charge. (Available from: Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, P.O. Box 6293, University, AL 35486.)

Highlights the findings of a two-year study of cost effective cooperation funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.
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New edition greatly expanded
The second edition of this comprehensive guide to health organizations, institutions, programs, and services covers over 6,000 more entries than the first edition. The entire directory has been thoroughly revised and four new sections have been added.

A unique one-stop reference
The directory offers a consolidation of information heretofore widely dispersed in general reference books. And much new material not available elsewhere has been gathered solely for inclusion here.

Entries provide full details
Unlike other directories in the field, the Medical and Health Information Directory is not just another "names and numbers" book. Entries provide not only basic details most often sought—such as names, addresses, phone numbers, key personnel—but also descriptive annotations where pertinent.

Conveniently arranged and indexed.
The coverage of subject matter in the 36 sections includes clinical medicine, the basic biomedical sciences, and technological and socio-economic aspects of health care. Indexes are supplied for many sections.

Reviewers Assess the Directory...
American Reference Books Annual 1978: "The extraordinary usefulness of this compilation is hard to overstate . . . . Recommended for reference use for general libraries, both public and academic, and for medical libraries, both small and large." (Shirley B. Hesslein)
Choice: One of the Outstanding Academic Books for 1978 (May 1979) "An important addition to the ready-reference shelf of all health science libraries. Recommended also for public libraries and community college libraries." (June 1978)
Library Journal: Included in Sci-Tech Books of 1977 . . . One hundred outstanding titles for general library collections. "There is bound to be something of interest and value to anyone needing health-related information . . . . If the library has no other similar subject coverage tome, this one is definitely an excellent choice." (March 1, 1978)
Postgraduate Medicine: "This volume can literally replace a whole shelf of directories." (Allan J. Ryan, MD, July 1978)
"Reference and Subscription Books Reviews": "No comparable directory containing such varied health-science information comes to mind . . . . The information in this book is well presented . . . . Recommended." (Booklist, July 1, 1978)